DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 918 52 LI 003 424

AUTHOR	Carnovsky, Leon
TITLE	The Foreign Student in the American Library School. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill. Graduate Library School.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-0662
PUB DATE	30 Nov 71
CONTRACT	OEC-0-70-2300(506)
NOTE	64p.;(13 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation; *Foreign Students; *Library Education; *Library Schools; Questionnaires; Surveys

ABSTRACT

The experience, observations, and reactions of foreign students to American library education are reported in this study. A questionnaire was sent to each foreign student who graduated from an accredited American library school between 1965-69. The questionnaire invited comments concerning the student's reaction to his year or more in an American library school; what benefits did he derive, what were his satisfactions and frustrations, his handicaps and shortcomings, his expectations whether or not realized, his difficulties on and off campus, his disappointments, and his ability to apply his American education to his subsequent career. Though most of the respondents expressed general satisfaction, there were numerous criticisms and suggestions for change. Since many of the criticisms echoed those of some American graduates who questioned the rationale of library education as typically offered, a chapter presents a conception of library education as an intellectual discipline, applicable to American and foreign students alike. The suggestions and recommendations which appear throughout the report are summarized and elaborated in a concluding chapter. (Author/NH)

ABSTRACT

This study is based on the experience, observations, and reactions of foreign students to American library education. It seeks to answer this question: How did the student react to his year or more in an American library school; what benefits did he derive, what were his satisfactions and frustrations, his handicaps and shortcomings, his expectations whether or not realized, his difficulties on and off campus, his disappointments, and his ability to apply his American education to his subsequent career.

Each American accredited library school was asked for a list of its 1965-69 foreign graduates, together with addresses. To these a questionnaire was sent inviting comments on the above points. Though most of the respondents expressed general satisfaction, there were numerous criticisms and suggestions for change. Since many of the criticisms echoed those of some American graduates who questioned the rationale of library education as typically offered, a chapter presents a conception of library education as an intellectual discipline, applicable to American and foreign students alike. Suggestions and recommendations appear throughout the report, and these are summarized and elaborated in a concluding chapter.

ED 058918

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BR-9-0662
PA 52

THE FINAL REPORT

O.E. Bureau of Research No. 9-0662
Contract No. OEC-0-70-2300 (506)

The Foreign Student in the American Library School

Leon Carnovsky, Professor

Graduate Library School
University of Chicago

Chicago, Illinois 60637

November 30, 1971

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

LI 003 424

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I The Foreign Student in the American Library School: General Considerations 4

CHAPTER II Responses from Foreign Students. 13

CHAPTER III A Conception of Education for Librarianship. 40

CHAPTER IV Conclusions. 50

BIBLIOGRAPHY 60

INTRODUCTION

The major objective of the investigation here reported was to consider library education programs in the United States for their relevance to the foreign student, at the same time throwing light on the difficulties faced by both library school and student, and ultimately identifying elements of success and failure in the training programs. But in the course of the study it became evident that much more was involved than the question of the application of training to a subsequent career; it was necessary to return once more to the broad question of library education not merely for the foreign student but as a discipline applicable to American students as well. For this reason, though the bulk of the report concentrates on the reactions of foreign students to their American library school experience, one chapter is devoted to a speculative and somewhat guarded consideration of education for librarianship, with an eye to meeting, at least in part, many of the criticisms raised by foreign graduates (and by many American graduates as well). A central question of course remains: What is the goal of library education? Is it to prepare persons for the continuing daily operations of libraries of many kinds? If so, what kinds of operations; can a line be drawn between those that may be readily mastered on the job and those that depend on a broader knowledge and the applications of judgment—roughly, truly professional activities? Or, on the other hand, should emphasis be placed on social and educational problems for which the library may contribute some solution or amelioration? For example, should library education point to the solution of problems in the organization and retrieval of information beyond what present libraries do? Is a choice necessary, or can and should the library education program do both? In practice, it is doubtful if any library school makes an either/or choice; it usually devotes attention to both, though inevitably the emphasis will vary from one school to another.

Ever since Melvil Dewey, American library education has emerged from and been influenced by American library practice. The graduates of the library schools were presumed to be qualified to occupy positions in operating institutions, at first primarily public and academic, later school and special libraries. This is not to say that library education was static; though anchored to certain basic indispensables—e.g., cataloging, classification, reference tools, book selection aids—it has continually changed and developed its content to reflect changes in library organization, materials, and functions. Since the point of departure in American library education has been—and still is in great measure—American libraries, we may ask if American libraries—their structure, organization, aims, functions—have enough in common with European or Asiatic or Middle Eastern libraries to make American library education applicable outside the United States.

This kind of question would not apply in the traditional academic disciplines, the humanities and sciences, for these are of universal concern. Insofar as these contribute to an ability to think clearly, to understand, they transcend national differences, and the foreign student may benefit from them just as may his American counterpart. Even in such professional disciplines as medicine and engineering, the ability to apply knowledge to practice bears no relation to national distinctions. The foreign student in the American university of course might still have problems, but they are of a different order from those dealing with application of new skills and abilities in his home country.

The foreign student in the American library school faces two basic types of problem: (1) those that most foreign students encounter, regardless of field of specialization—e.g., problems of adaptation to a new environment; and (2) those unique to librarianship—broadly, the problems of applying what he has learned in a foreign milieu. (Incidentally, both types of problem may be applied in reverse to the American student attending a foreign university and specializing in library education.)

The study begins with some general considerations about the foreign student, based essentially on investigations and observations of others and reported in professional literature. Since an initial question is one of admissibility and procedures for determining whether or not a foreign applicant is acceptable, some attention is devoted to this matter; and here the writer was fortunate in having available the questionnaires which had been returned to Roland R. Piggford of the State University of New York at Albany in the course of his 1970 investigation of practices and policies relating to the admission of foreign students to library schools. Piggford's study was made at the request of the Library Education Division of the American Library Association.

We next come to the heart of the inquiry: the reaction of the foreign student to his residence in America and his judgment of the virtues, limitations, and defects of American library education as he experienced it. Each of the accredited library schools was sent the following letter:

> I am about to undertake a study of the foreign student in the American library school, based on information from the schools and from foreign students, and collected by correspondence, questionnaire, and interview. Since I shall have access to the information recently gathered by the Library Education Division's Equivalencies and Reciprocity Committee through its questionnaire on the overseas student, I am not repeating any of the questions included therein. However, there are two additional matters on which I should appreciate your assistance:
>
> (1) Could you send me the names and present

> addresses of foreign students who have taken degrees (Master's or Doctor's) during 1965-70?
>
> (2) Could you provide the number of foreign students enrolled in each of the last 5 years (1965-69)? (Omit students from Canada; include students from Puerto Rico.)
>
> Sometime within the next year I expect to visit many library schools, to discuss with the faculty the problems encountered in teaching foreign students, and to confer with the foreign students in residence at the time. I plan to correspond with overseas students who have attended American library schools in order to assess their satisfactions, frustrations, and particularly the relevance of the American program to their library careers.

Responses were received from 41 schools, though not all schools were able to provide all the information desired, particularly pertaining to annual enrollments, and in one case the information was considered confidential. Nevertheless the response was large enough to permit taking the next step. This was a letter to each graduate whose name and address was provided, and the results are reported in the appropriate chapter. In addition to the correspondence, visits were made to a number of library schools and to the Library of Congress, where interviews were conducted with directors, faculty, foreign students currently enrolled, and with some foreign graduates of library schools.

The comments from the foreign students brought into sharp focus the need for re-thinking the nature of library education; therefore, as noted in the beginning, a chapter entitled "A Conception of Education for Librarianship" has been added.

The writer is greatly indebted to the library schools who generously cooperated in this investigation. He is particularly grateful to the foreign graduates who wrote so fully and frankly, thereby contributing the basis for seriously re-thinking the role of the library school not only in accommodating students from abroad but in making their programs more viable and intellectually more satisfying.

And finally, he extends his appreciation and gratitude to the Bureau of Research, Office of Education, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through whose assistance this study was made possible.

THE FOREIGN STUDENT IN THE AMERICAN LIBRARY SCHOOL:

General Considerations

Since the technological aspects of library work are so highly developed in the United States, American library schools annually attract a considerable number of students from other countries. It is generally expected that most of the students will return to their home countries, better equipped to organize and operate a library program, or perhaps to participate in programs of library education.

The assimilation into American institutions of higher education of foreign students of an almost infinite variety poses formidable problems, both to the host institution and to the student; and given the variety, it is difficult if not impossible to generalize. Nevertheless it is fair to say that the motivations that lead foreign students to attend American colleges and universities are the same as those that bring such students to American library schools; and many of the problems they face are fairly common regardless of field of study.

Library school students make up a very small proportion of the foreign student population. In 1970 the Institute of International Education reported that 134,959 foreign students studied in the United States in 1969-70 (nearly 10 per cent from Canada), but of these less than 1 per cent were enrolled in library schools. During the five years 1965-69 the foreign student enrolment reported from 33 accredited library schools (out of some 50) was as follows:

1965	310
1966	394
1967	379
1968	397
1969	365

The five-year enrolment in the 33 schools ranged from 9 (Denver) to 287 (Pittsburgh). The median was 48 (Emory and Rosary). For individual schools the annual enrolment was usually small, less than a dozen, but in some cases it was surprisingly high and must have imposed a serious burden on a faculty already coping with the customary responsibilities. Enrolment of 15 to 20 in a single year was not uncommon, and in some cases it rose beyond 20:

Columbia:	25 in 1966.
Drexel:	26 in 1965; 22 in 1967.
Michigan:	32 in 1965; 27 in 1966; 22 in 1967.
Oklahoma:	22 in 1966; 21 in 1967.
Peabody:	22 in 1966.
Pittsburgh:	38 in 1965; 55 in 1966; 70 in 1967; 65 in 1968; 59 in 1969.

Southern California: 21 in 1969.
Western Michigan: 23 in 1968.
Wisconsin: 22 in 1968; 27 in 1969.

It is fruitless to attempt to account for the variations from school to school or from year to year. Many factors are responsible, ranging from the hospitality (or indifference) toward foreign students at one school to tuition and living costs, program, faculty, and countless more at others. There seems to be a decline in annual enrolments, but the pattern is not consistent and in some schools the number remains fairly stable or even on the increase.[1]

No one seriously questions the desirability in general of cross-national education, even though the results are speculative rather than conclusive. Whether or not the vague objective "international understanding" is ever achieved, no one can say. Often enough, unfortunately, some unhappy experience may lead to dislike or worse for the host country; let an African or an Asian or a Latin American be treated rudely (or let an American be similarly treated in a foreign land) and the result may be dislike or distrust or a reaffirmed nationalism. Even exposure to public attitudes or treatment of one group by another (racial conflicts, for example) may transform affection to hostility. In point of fact, however, the testimony (evidence is hard to come by) is quite in the opposite direction; especially after prolonged exposure to a foreign culture, typical with foreign students, attitudes are more likely to be sympathetic than hostile.

But the probability is that foreign study is not undertaken with this end in view, at least as seen by the student himself. He comes because he wants the training or education that may not be available (at all or of the same type or quality) at home, and he believes such training may be applied in his own country. Or he may have in mind the prospect of using his education as a step in laying down permanent roots in a new land. Or he may simply be interested in adventure, in the chance for new experience. "International understanding" may be a by-product of any of these; certainly it is not a dominant goal.

In 1962 a study of the international exchange program, conducted in 20 countries, was undertaken for the U. S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.[2] As might be anticipated, a major goal of the grantees was good training in the field of specialization, training that could be applied on returning home. A second goal was greater knowledge of American life and values. All the respondents testified to having derived some value from the American experience. Such benefits were "more often in feelings of confidence and authority" rather than in tangible material rewards, like increased salary or a better job; in addition, there were the benefits of contacts and friendships, of heightened appreciation, of broader perspectives.

Not all who came to America found the opportunity to apply their new attainments on their return—a finding to which we shall draw attention later. Thus, a Turkish teacher of English felt that he mistakenly had taken courses in audio-visual aids, but whatever knowledge he gained could not be applied and he therefore considered his time in such courses a waste. Others regretted the lack of opportunity to practice (in the U.S.) what they had been taught. In some cases the students felt some frustration on returning home: jobs were not to be found, expected promotions were not forthcoming because of the prolonged absence, even conflicts were experienced with superiors or fellow-workers. Another type of frustration is emphasized in the following comment by Daly C. Lavergne, former Director of the Office of International Training of the Agency for International Development:

> The occasional effort made by colleges and universities to obtain extensions for AID participants to remain and pursue additional studies...is usually inconsistent with the program's objectives. Too often in the past this kind of extension has resulted in longer stays, training in excess of need, and subsequent disappointment for the student when he returns home and finds that he is over-qualified for the job for which training was requested. In other instances it has doubtless contributed to the participant's desire and efforts to remain permanently in the U.S. and seek employment here.[3]

Also worth quoting as a caveat to the foreign student who may come with too high expectations is the comment in The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?, a study by a committee of Education and World Affairs (New York):

> It is frequently found that the graduate and professional training given foreign students is unrealistic in terms of the conditions they encounter when they return to their home country. For example, in some cases the equipment they have learned to use is not available. In others, the level of development of the art or science makes other knowledge more necessary than that gained in the United States.[4]

Overall, conditions prevailing at home—lack of funds or facilities, lack of hospitality or readiness to change—have militated against implementing ideas, however worthy, that the returning student brought with him. The observations reflecting reactions nearly a decade ago are not much different from those that might be evoked today. At least they strike a familiar chord when compared with comments of foreign librarians who have gone back after a year or longer in an American library school.

Though we shall later present the reactions of foreign librarians, it is important to note the observations and judgments of library school teachers and administrators concerning the foreign students they have known. In 1960 a committee of the Association of American Library Schools conducted a study to ascertain the problems the schools faced in accommodating the foreign student and to learn of any special provision or requirement in their admission or education.[5] While admission at that time imposed no undue problems, they arose later, with the customary language deficiency, lack of familiarity with the structure of American higher education, difficulty of adapting to American life and customs, and financial burdens looming large, and adding to the aggravations that a library school director would normally encounter. Comments from two schools reflect attitudes widely held:

> (1) "Faculty members have said that they like having foreign students. Other students enjoy having them and their presence, we think, is desirable for the education of American students."
>
> (2) "Strictly speaking, as far as our program and enrollment is concerned, we would just as soon not have any foreign students. However, we feel it an obligation on our part to do what we can."

But problems of admission are not the only ones; others are even more troublesome and revolve around the relevance of American library education to the foreigner who expects to return home. Generalizations are difficult, since library schools vary widely from one to another, and especially, as Swank points out, since "foreign librarianship is not a concept that is useful for purposes of generalization. It is not one thing in relation to American librarianship; it is many different things."[6] (A point to be pondered in current considerations of a possible international library school). Swank then pinpoints a number of factors that bring into question the applicability of American library education to foreign librarianship; among them, government/library relations in the U.S. as compared with those elsewhere; the wide differences in university structure and curricula as between the U.S. with its centralized library administration and a foreign country where "even the administration of the university is not centralized."

Again, a library curriculum centered on American library collections may have little to offer the potential library director or assistant whose future is tied to collections in non-Western languages; to quote Swank: "The Indian librarian might well protest the time he spent learning the forms of catalog entries for Roman classics when he should have been learning those for Sanskrit."

Thirdly, many library procedures may have little in common. Knowledge of Dewey and Library of Congress classification systems may be of as little practical use to the Indian or Chinese student as inculcation of Colon or UDC would be to the American, and Swank observes: "...it would seem futile to try to teach librarians from all parts of the globe the specific techniques that are applied in their own parts."

In the fourth place, the educational background of the foreign student differs sharply from that of the American. The foreigner may have had virtually no experience with using a library at all; or the library he has used is nothing like the one for which American training is envisaged. And of course the limitations in English cannot be ignored, and for many foreign students this handicap may be a traumatic experience.

Swank concludes with a number of pertinent suggestions to ameliorate the difficulties faced by both library schools and foreign students; two of them deal with admissions. To insure that only qualified foreign students are admitted, we should insist on high standards and refuse to admit the patently unqualified applicants. Candidates should be tested for English competence and, where possible, for general educational background, such testing to take place before the student arrives in America. It might be noted in passing that Robert Stevens, Dean of the Graduate School of Library Studies, University of Hawaii, on the basis of extensive interviewing of students who had returned to Japan concluded that "on the whole the schools attended do not appear to have done a particularly good job of either language testing or training...In some cases no tests of English language ability were required either in Japan or after arrival in the United States."[7]

The problems of applying American library training in a foreign climate have been identified by many others; to pinpoint them succinctly we may cite the observations of Asheim:

> "...the solutions that work in one cultural milieu do not necessarily work in another. We have brought in the Dewey Decimal System, a classification which even in its latest, more flexible editions is still inadequate for the areas in which the greatest amount of publication is likely to take place abroad—in the literature, the history, the philosophy, and the religion of the country. We advocate the use of LC cards, forgetting how little of a foreign library's collection will consist of the titles, let alone the editions, which the cards represent. We introduce our subject headings, overlooking the fact that languages are not made up merely of different words, but of different concepts and approaches. We order electrical equipment where there is little or no electricity; we purchase bookmobiles where there are no roads; we donate

> the outdated discards from our own collections to countries that need the latest information but cannot read English."8

Problems of Admission.—Piggford's study of library school admission practices (see Introduction) reported the procedures, based on testimony and experience, of 57 library schools, 43 of them accredited by the American Library Association. These 57 reported an enrollment of 540 foreign students in the fall of 1969. (This total did not include students from Canada; it did, however, include foreign students who had enrolled in Canadian library schools, a total of 33.) In 32 of the reporting schools the enrollment was small, from only one to 7 or 8; at the other extreme, one school, the University of Pittsburgh, reported no less than 44. (Pittsburgh later reported an even higher enrollment in that year: 59).

The largest contribution of foreign students was from Taiwan, with 141, though without a heavy concentration in any one library school. Next in order came Korea, Hongkong, India, the Philippines, the United Kingdom (largely because of the Canadian schools), and Cuba. Altogether, no less than 61 nations were represented by one or more students.

Clearly, the first question facing both foreign students and library schools is that of admissibility. By and large the schools do not impose any special restrictions on applicants from abroad, though a few limit the total number they are willing to admit and a few restrict the number from any particular country. In some cases the schools impose the limitation because of the difficulty of finding library positions for those who plan to remain in the U.S. Although there are exceptions, virtually all schools dispense with the requirement of a library science background, either in an academic institution or in a library. Nor is the student expected to commit himself to return to his home country upon completion of the program in the American library school.

The library schools were asked if they required foreign students to take the Graduate Record Examination as an index of admissibility. Of the 53 who responded to this question, 21 required the examination. The minimum score required of those entering at the Master's level ranged from 700 to 1200; the median was 900. (Somewhat higher scores were required of applicants to advanced certificate and doctoral programs.)

Since a vast majority of the foreign students came from non-English speaking countries, a knowledge of English was generally made a condition of admission. To measure such knowledge the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) was usually required; the Michigan and other tests were also employed occasionally.

The schools using TOEFL were asked:

> What does your institution consider the minimum performance (in terms of total score) indicating acceptable English proficiency for admission to your graduate library science program without further intensive training in English?

On a scale of 400 to above 625, 13 out of 35 schools required a 550-575 score as the minimum for admission; three set a higher score (600-625) and 17 a lower, usually 500-550, but in two cases as low as 450-500. Since all figures are minima we cannot tell how many students were well above them, nor whether such figures as 550-575 are high enough to assure competence.

However, for most purposes a score of 550-575 is satisfactory as indicating ability to carry on a program of study in the library school; the National Advisory Council for TOEFL observes that "with few exceptions foreign students who score in the 550-600 range on TOEFL are entirely capable of coping with a full academic program." In some fields, especially where English writing ability is essential, the score may be too low; in others—mathematics and sciences—the suggested score may be higher than necessary. In the study of librarianship, where the emphasis would fall on ability to comprehend oral presentation and to read rapidly and with comprehension rather than on writing, the score seems appropriate. We cannot say how students who testified to difficulty with English in library school performed on TOEFL, or even if they took it. It is well to bear in mind that facility in English is only one factor, and not the most important, that accounts for success in most academic programs; and students may attribute their difficulties to the language when the true cause may lie elsewhere. Still, since so many experienced difficulty, it would seem desirable to apply the minimum fairly strictly, especially where the institution does not have facilities for offering instruction in English for those who need it.

With few exceptions the universities of which library schools are a part conduct orientation sessions for foreign students; in a few cases the library schools themselves conduct such sessions, and in at least two universities, Hawaii and Washington, orientation is provided by the institution as well as by the library school. Though the nature of the orientation varies, the attempt is made to help the students adapt themselves to the new and strange environment, with attention to American culture and student values; the university structure; the city, with field trips provided; immigration regulations; housing facilities; medical assistance; and clothing necessities. At North Carolina counselors are assigned to help the students get settled in their dormitories and to assist in general acclimatization during their early residence.

So much, then, for the general approach of library schools to the foreign students. There is, of course, another side: the reaction of the students to American library education—the problems they met, the satisfactions and dissatisfactions they were aware of, their opinion of the curriculum in general, and particularly their experience in applying what presumably they were taught, or had learned, to a subsequent career.

FOOTNOTES

1. Patricia Breivik states: "There were 485 international students reported in our library schools during the winter of 1968, not including any who may have been enrolled at Oklahoma, Syracuse, or Wayne." "Objective-Type Examinations and the International Student." Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring 1970, p. 297.

   It is difficult—and for present purposes of little importance—to cite precise annual figures. For 1959-60 the number was reported as 187, but this omitted Canadians and included Puerto Ricans. (See "The Foreign Student in the Accredited Library School," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Fall 1960, p. 94).

2. The Effectiveness of the Exchange Program. International Research Associates, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York 20.

3. "University and Government: Two Views of the Foreign Graduate Student," in University, Government, and the Foreign Graduate Student. College Entrance Examination Board, 1969, p. 45.

4. Pp. 16-17.

5. Leon Carnovsky, "The Foreign Student in the Accredited Library School," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Fall 1960, pp. 94-107.

6. Raynard C. Swank, "The Education of Foreign Librarians," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring 1961, p. 191.

7. To be published in the MITA Bulletin of Library and Information Science.

8. Lester Asheim, Librarianship in the Developing Countries. Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1966, pp. 65-66.

II. RESPONSES FROM FOREIGN STUDENTS

It is not easy to show a direct relationship, especially a causal one, between the education anyone has received and what subsequently happens to him. It is also difficult to do so in a specialized area of education, such as preparation for library work. One may become an excellent librarian for reasons that have nothing to do with his library preparation; he may never have enrolled in a formal library education program and the kind of work he is doing may depend on qualities not commonly identified with library education programs.

If this is true of preparation for work in American libraries, it is even more so for work in foreign libraries. Many foreign students take positions in American libraries and are assigned to tasks requiring abilities that are quite irrelevant to library school instruction; others return to their home countries and may encounter library conditions so different from those in the United States that whatever the quality of the instruction they have received it has little if any bearing on librarianship abroad.

The relation of library education to a subsequent career defies investigation because it is further complicated by the variations among library schools. One school may stress library practices in the United States; another may emphasize broad principles, highly theoretical but applicable anywhere. Even within a single school there are likely to be wide differences in the way courses are taught, in the quality of the teachers, in the demands made on the students. A foreign student conceivably may have derived a good deal of satisfaction and profit from his library school, but his reactions might have been quite different had he attended another school. And the opposite is no less true. If it is difficult to generalize about foreign students, it is scarcely less so about library schools.

A partial answer about relevance might be sought through a close analysis of what the student actually does in his professional position and a search for how he was prepared for it in library school. But this presupposes a very close cause-and-effect relationship; it is possible that much that is good in library school instruction is reflected only vaguely and intangibly in attitudes, enthusiasm, imagination, judgment, rather than in specific activities. Even instruction in such tangibles as cataloging, classification, reference work may carry over to internal library organization, though the details may differ sharply from those emphasized in formal courses. Whatever the method used to identify relevance, we might as well recognize that the conclusions must be largely subjective, interpretive, and even impressionistic.

The report that follows is based on the responses given by foreign graduates of American accredited library schools to a questionnaire. It was sent in the form of an open letter:

To Selected Graduates of American Library Schools.

> This inquiry is addressed to you as a graduate of an American library school. I am particularly interested in your reactions, good and bad, to the library training program, and especially in learning whether your training has influenced or affected your actual library work. Would you please take about half an hour to comment on as many of the following questions as you can? Or you might prefer simply to prepare a general statement based on them; in fact, you might wish to go beyond these questions and to comment on your American library school experience. Your answer will be treated in complete confidence and your name will not be used in my report.
>
> 1. What were the major benefits you derived from attending an American library school? (Please include reactions to the country, to the college or university as a whole, and to the library school in particular.)
>
> 2. What were the major handicaps or shortcomings?
>
> 3. Did you expect to get more from the training than you actually received? (If so, please be as specific as you can.)
>
> 4. Was the method of teaching different from that in your own country? Were you able to adjust to it, or was adjustment difficult? (For example, too much lecturing, too much reading required, too much class discussion, too much written work, not enough individual attention from the faculty, etc.)
>
> 5. MOST IMPORTANT: Were you able to make use of your library school preparation in your subsequent career? If not, was this because of the failure of the library school, or for other reasons?
>
> 6. What changes in the program would you suggest, especially for foreign students?
>
> 7. Did you have any information about the university you were going to attend before coming to America? Do you think you would have found such information of value? Did you actually know much about the library school before you arrived?
>
> 8. How did you happen to select the library school you attended?
>
> You may not be able to answer all these questions, but please answer as many as possible. And please be completely frank. Let me conclude by thanking you most sincerely for your participation in this project, and by assuring you of my deepest gratitude.

Earlier, the library schools had been asked to supply the names and addresses of their foreign graduates since 1965; this resulted in a compilation of 1,255 names.[1] Many of the addresses were out of date or unknown, and of the 1,145 letters sent, 166 were undeliverable. Each letter was accompanied by a self-addressed envelope (stamped, in the case of American addresses). Responses were received from 165 persons, a return of nearly 17 per cent. Of these, 48 came from abroad, the remainder from the United States and Canada.

At first glance the number of responses seems disappointingly small in light of the number of inquiries mailed, but for present purposes it was altogether satisfactory since we were primarily interested in reactions and impressions rather than in the number or proportion reacting in a certain way. In fact, the analysis showed that we soon reached the point of diminishing returns; the responses that arrived late added no new reactions to those already recorded. A heavier response was hardly to be expected, especially from abroad where we could not provide postage and where a response would entail considerable writing in a less familiar language. Originally it was feared that the responses would be heavily dominated by courteous comments of dubious frankness, but this fear turned out to be largely groundless. The respondents were frank in their remarks, frequently critical, and sometimes even caustic.

The responses from the graduates have been organized in the order of the questions raised in the letter. This is convenient since most of the responses followed the questions directly. In what follows no attempt has been made to identify either the individual or the library school he attended.

1. What were the major benefits you derived from attending an American library school? (Please include reactions to the country, to the college or university as a whole, and to the library school in particular.)

It is of course difficult to state "benefits" with much precision. Certainly the great majority were grateful for the experience; they enjoyed the opportunity of living in a new country; they frequently developed a sense of loyalty to the college or university; and in spite of criticisms to be noted later, they apparently were convinced that they had received considerable benefit from the library school, whether or not they were later in a position to make direct applications of what they had learned. One would expect such benefits to be more apparent to those who remained to take library positions in the United States, but even most of those who had returned home were grateful for what they had received.

Not surprisingly, the benefit mentioned most often was the knowledge of library "philosophy" and practice; what libraries were all about and how they were organized to make their programs effective. Many stressed the value of bibliographical courses, the opportunity to become familiar with books and bibliographies previously unknown, whether or not this familiarity could be translated into later application in libraries in America or at home. Along with this was the satisfaction of learning about reader assistance, the use of reference books, and even the opportunity of learning more about one's own country. Although there was no general agreement (indeed, some took a contrary view), some graduates liked the informal class atmosphere, the high degree of academic freedom, and the maintenance of high academic standards (particularly difficult to interpret--high as compared to what?). A student from Hong Kong was initially "shocked by the liberty, daring attitude, freedom of expression..." but she eventually saw some advantages to such freedom in contrast to the submissiveness and authoritarianism in education to which she had been accustomed. An Indian college librarian commented on his discovery of magazine indexes, not only for his personal use but for his new-found ability to apply such knowledge in working with library patrons. Others welcomed the chance to become acquainted with the hardware and techniques of computer applications to information retrieval; with the practice of interlibrary loans; with an awareness of government interest and participation in library development.

Altogether aside from the substantive advantages derived from courses and residence on an American campus, many respondents mentioned the advantage of the professional degree as the open door to library appointment and advancement (although one person wrote "I am afraid the profession is too credential-conscious"). The importance of the degree was noted most frequently by those who remained in the United States; whether the degree itself made much difference in job placement to those who returned may be questioned, although conceivably the education represented by the degree may have contributed.

Some of the most interesting comments referred to reactions to the United States, mostly good but often qualified. One expressed as a major benefit "an opportunity to know some American families, their friendliness and interest in international understanding and interest in peace," but he also noted (his observations of) "the problems of affluence such as obesity, high medical costs, poverty amidst plenty, the plight of the aged." Appreciation of life in America was expressed, often in quite moving terms by refugees from Cuba. A student from India wrote: "I have a positive and respectful view toward American Society, and this view is contradictory to the view I had formed before I came here; through mass media." Another, from Colombia, admitted to a personal distaste for the United States before coming, but because of contacts with library school staff and students and with others beyond the university he testified that he changed his way "of thinking about the people but not about the government." Unfortunately, this sense of harmony was sometimes vitiated by sullen if not hostile attitudes of Americans toward the foreigner, and a long period intervened before a more friendly feeling could be restored. Thus, a student from

Iceland wrote:

> I came to the U.S. one month after the riots in 1967. The people I met outside and on campus were neither kind nor friendly and the tension was too great for them to want to get to know any "strange" people.... After my studies my opinion of the American people was very negative, but this impression changed very much after I had had the opportunity to work with people, and then I made many friends who have enriched my life and kept me in touch with the rest of the world.

On the other hand, more than one commented on the revelations of American campus life and the system of higher education in general, and felt they had received a better understanding of student aspirations and disappointments. But in the last analysis it was the knowledge of the American library system that (understandably) made the sharpest impact. As one Chinese student wrote: "The philosophy of the library and library practices impressed me the most. The effort to make the library not only an institution to preserve learning materials and to promote learning and the use of library materials but also a democratic institution where ideas of all shades and colors are allowed to co-exist and to function." A librarian from the Philippines considered working opportunities and conditions "fabulous when compared to what a librarian could have here." The wealth of library literature exceeded anything he could find at home.

With few exceptions the faculty was considered helpful and willing to devote time to students outside formal classes. A student from India wrote: "The freedom of the library school included ready access to professors and administrators which is lacking in the Indian system. I was helped considerably by faculty-administrator sympathy and assistance." The opportunity to observe such libraries as the Library of Congress left an indelible impression, a value in itself in spite of the difficulty of subsequently applying the knowledge thus gained.

Especially for those who found a place in American librarianship after graduation, the benefits of library education were obvious. Many of them found a congenial career which was all but impossible in the home country; they developed a competence which they could apply. Undoubtedly many others already had considerable competence based on non-library education and experience at home, and the possession of the library school degree served as an opening wedge to a library post where such competence could be capitalized. For those who returned, the direct applications were not quite so evident, but at least in some instances the students testified to the impact on their professional thinking and the influence on how they worked. Here are three relevant observations from abroad, edited to eliminate references to the institutions to which they refer. The first came from Israel:

> "The benefits are hard to define. I would venture to say that I derived from the library school the assurance that comes from being a professional librarian and not a sort of glorified technician. I cannot say whether this could be acquired at another library school or at another university in the U.S. I came to America somewhat in awe of some achievements of American librarianship and with a rather poor opinion of the American way of life, which I knew mainly from hearsay. I returned to my country with a respect for the achievements of American librarianship and with great sympathy for the American people and their problems. During my stay I made friends with people of varied backgrounds, but these were mostly intellectuals.
>
> "For me the University came as near as possible to my idea of what a University should be: a 'Universitas Literarum' with plenty of freedom (as long as one works hard). I think of it as my true Alma Mater.
>
> "The decision to sacrifice my savings was largely prompted by the feeling that I was stagnating professionally and my decision to work for a degree came later. My year at the (Blank) library school gave me the necessary perspective of librarianship in general and of librarianship in my own country in particular."

The following comment is taken from the letter sent by a student who had returned to South Africa.

> "Perhaps the major benefit was being exposed to American librarianship as a whole. Librarianship in the States is very vital, vigourous and questioning. I found it to be strongly aware of the environment in which it exists, both internal and external, and actively trying to solve the problems, social and professional, of that environment. ...The MARC project, electronic photocomposing, computer generated indexes, book catalogs, and library automation in general are revolutionising traditional practices in librarianship throughout the world. But because the basic innovations are occurring in the U.S. I found it a most vital and worthwhile place to study...I find it most difficult to sum up in a few words my attitude to American librarianship as a whole. Perhaps socially aware, introspective to a fault, frightened by technological advances, experimenting, exciting, needing to take the initiative away from the 'Information Scientists', sum up some of the impressions I gained.
>
> "From what I saw of the country I loved it. I was impressed by the richness and fertility of the countryside...but the Used car lot-Coca Cola-Howard Johnson syndrome endlessly repeated left a saccharin after-taste in my mouth. Politically too the promise seems to have turned sour. I was shocked by

> the violence and hatred that abounded in 1968. This must sound strange coming from a South African. We have serious social ailments here, but social recalcitrance and a common resort to violence are not among them."
>
> The third selection is from a long letter from Australia.
>
> "I think the most important benefit was an increase in my ability to think of library processes as interrelated. A second was a decision to try very hard to keep up with the current periodical literature in librarianship, instead of searching it retrospectively through Library Literature. I also was able to spend some time looking at large and expensive reference works carefully, and talking to experienced users about them.
>
> "I benefited enormously from living in New York, and visited Cambridge/Boston several times. The art galleries and opera were a continuing delight to me. So was the New York Times. I got to know some American students well, liked almost all of them, and still correspond with a few.
>
> "I suspect that my enthusiasm for the library school is not quite as great, but I did admire and like the institution."

2. What were the major handicaps or shortcomings?

Anyone who has spent much time with the literature of librarianship—for that matter, anyone who has been identified with library education as faculty member or student in recent years—cannot fail to be aware of criticisms, and not surprisingly these criticisms are present in the reaction of foreign students as well. Many of them are precisely those constantly made by Americans; others relate to the failure of the schools to take into account, or to deal with, the specific problems of foreign students; still others are seen as difficulties inherent in the students themselves.

The phrasing of the question made it difficult to differentiate among handicaps, shortcomings, and criticisms, but for present purposes this is unnecessary. The "handicaps" tended to be those inherent in the students themselves; the criticisms pertained to the curriculum, the faculty, and certain external factors; and shortcomings could be identified with both.

Undoubtedly the personal handicap mentioned most frequently was insufficient fluency in English—this in spite of the fact that all the foreign students came with some language background and most had performed acceptably on English language examinations, at least acceptable enough to warrant library school admission. But ability to pass an examination is a far cry from facility in understanding and absorbing lectures rapidly given, from confidence in presenting an oral report to a class, from comfortable participation in discussions with American student groups, and particularly from ease in preparing written reports.

Closely related to the language handicap was lack of familiarity with the American cultural background; even students who felt sufficiently at ease with English as a language had some trouble in adapting to American customs, and in following discussions related to American history, traditions, government, and social conditions. And since much of the instruction was keyed to American society and education, students without some background in cultural differences were often at a loss in placing the lectures in context, even though they had no difficulty in understanding the language itself.

Other handicaps were mentioned less frequently. Surprisingly, shortage of funds was not cited by many, possibly because foundation and scholarship grants, personal resources, and grants from home governments were liberal enough to preclude financial difficulties. Some students, particularly from the Far East, found it difficult to adjust to American food, and a few experienced unfortunate racial problems. One Chinese student reported that upon graduation she was offered a position which she was unable to accept because of inability to find suitable housing, which she attributed to discrimination.

Some impatience was felt with the complexities of registration procedures, requiring an inordinate amount of time and causing considerable inconvenience. But red tape and similar exasperations are much more likely to be institution—rather than library school—induced, and aside from momentary irritation are hardly likely to be serious.

The criticisms of the library school curriculum were reminiscent of those commonly made by American students. Still, there were differences. Several commented that the curricular and other regulations were much too rigid and imposed without taking into account either the background of the student (such as courses already taken in his own country, or his mastery of a subject through private study or experience) or his future expectations. At least one complained that he was denied the opportunity of taking one or more courses that he wanted because he was forced into others that he considered unnecessary and the subject matter of which was already familiar; or because the course desired had been earmarked for Ph.D. candidates only.

Needless to say, not all library schools are guilty of such inflexibility. The real question remains whether any or how much flexibility should be permitted, but certainly it is reasonable to expect students (American or foreign) to be excused from courses the content of which is already familiar to them. But beyond the question of flexibility there is the matter of the curriculum itself, and some attention will next be paid to the negative reactions which have been expressed. (A caution should be noted: even though criticisms are frequently harsh, the fact remains that in most cases they do not override the benefits reported. The reverse is of course no less true: the benefits should not be readily accepted without qualifying them by the negative reactions.)

Taking the curriculum as a whole, the critics were of two minds. On the one hand, a large number complained that not enough attention was given to practical applications, to the opportunity to deal with matters that constituted so much of the course work where theory had been stressed. On the other hand, theory and broad concepts were said to be dealt with too superficially; however, the demand for more practice was far more frequent. A third criticism was that such contemporary concerns as the storage and retrieval of information and especially computer applications were either ignored entirely or treated much too superficially. All such criticisms have been made by American students, but other complaints, particularly those dealing with individual courses, were more relevant to the foreign student. Thus, cataloging courses were criticized because not enough opportunity was provided for practice with books in other than the roman alphabet. Emphasis on the Decimal and Library of Congress classifications, to the total or virtual neglect of UDC and Colon, was deplored (even L.C. was sometimes considered slighted in favor of D.C.). It was frequently complained that familiarity with reference tools in non-Western languages was not provided for at all and the all but exclusive attention to reference works unlikely to be encountered in the home libraries was considered a waste of time. In this connection, many students complained of the excessive emphasis on memorization of reference titles and detail—a bore in itself and of no practical application in a library where the books would not be held. (Even if such books were later acquired, familiarity with them would not depend on memosizing details.)[2] The general complaint concerning the American focus to the almost complete neglect of foreign library applications was ably summarized by a student from India:

> I myself experienced no handicaps by attending an American school. However, I must say that American library education is constructed around American practices and institutions and American objectives. One wonders as to how a foreign student (particularly an Asian) would benefit from the Dewey Classification when it is hopelessly inadequate for Asian literature; Library of Congress classification, devised on the basis of LC needs, with inadequate numbers and subject headings for Asian literature; university/college library procedures when Asian university/college libraries have nothing in common with American practice; public, college, university library administration when they vary violently from the American practice in Asian countries.

Another target of criticism was the faculty. Even though many, perhaps a majority, of the respondents had kind words for their teachers—their competence, kindness, helpfulness, sympathy—others were outspoken in condemnation. Some teachers were considered completely unqualified, or decidedly limited in their awareness of library conditions or practices outside the United States. Some discourtesy was noted, attributed to the provincial attitude of the American teachers—and at times of fellow students—toward foreigners. At least one person commented on experiencing "atrocious examples of teaching," the students treated as though they were on the high school level. American students, too, have criticized their faculty; the unique factors here are attitudes of faculty members toward foreign students. As elsewhere in this report, it is impossible to generalize; variations are sharp not only from one school to another, but even from one teacher to another in the same school. Still, it is worth noting that disenchantment with teachers was expressed often enough to suggest the seriousness of the problem.

A few commented on certain subtle (or not so subtle) negative attitudes on the part of both faculty and fellow-students. Thus, one person wrote that he was in no danger of forgetting that as a foreigner he was something of an outsider; another was the target of snide remarks because he was a recipient of financial aid from an American source; and certain prejudicial attitudes of people not connected with school or university were all too evident.

One or two additional comments may be noted. There was some feeling that faculty members assigned as academic advisors were uninterested or incompetent in an advisory role. Related to this was a sense of unease or lack of orientation with regard to American life and customs, and several felt that an orientation period would have been helpful. (Others, however, stated that such orientation to which they were exposed did not help much because it was too limited or too hasty.)

Many of the points already noted become more vivid when expressed in the language of the respondents themselves. Thus, a student from Hong Kong (now living in the U.S.) wrote:

> "I had a miserable time in library school, having to adjust myself at the age of 22, to a completely new way of teaching and educational method. At the same time, I realized I had learned to be independent, to trust in my own ability to cope with problems and the need to think for myself. On the whole, I was grateful."

Another student, from Taiwan, poignantly expressed the language problem so frequently noted:

> "Whenever we had a panel discussion I could only be the honorable guest without strength to stand up and express what I thought. I dared not raise any questions. When I was taking examinations I had to be very careful not only about the answers but also about spelling and grammar. I could hardly complete

> the questions in time, even if I thoroughly understood them."

Another comment on the language problem was somewhat different. A student from Nigeria wrote:

> "It seems that Americans expect everybody to speak like Americans and are very impatient if one does otherwise. The other side of the account was that many professors and students were not speaking 'standard American English.' They used their own local accents which other Americans managed to understand but which used to be Greek to foreign students."

The "discussion method" elicited this comment from a student from Singapore:

> "Some teachers introduced the 'group discussion' method; I felt some 'big mouths' just wanted to sound off. Never had I felt so great a waste of time in these classes when later I found that nothing much had actually been said during the entire class hour."

On inflexibility, especially for foreign students, a Thailand student wrote:

> "Some required courses should be flexible for international students. Courses suitable for American students are not so effective for foreign. It is a waste of time and money for them to take those courses only to graduate. Foreign students should have the chance to take selected courses instead of some of those required. Foreign student advisors should have some background of countries from which the students come, to help them select courses."

Again from Taiwan:

> "Despite the fame of (Blank) University, its library school is too ordinary. It was completely traditional (not a single course on automation or computers) and mostly basic training. I found other schools to be more enterprising."

And finally, from Iceland, a ringing condemnation of the entire program because of its inapplicability to the librarian returning home:

> "Actual training was nil . . . . For foreign librarians who return to their home country where they have to create library systems and perhaps teach other librarians, the training and the knowledge of know-how is absolutely indispensable . . . . Returning foreigners

have to perform all operations without supervision from then on and never really learned how to do them."

3. Did you expect to get more from the training than you actually received? (If so, please be as specific as you can.)

Let it be said at once that overwhelmingly the responses were "No." This may be a reflection of attitudes ranging from ignorance of what to expect all the way to complete satisfaction. Indeed, some said they received more than they had expected. Many of the negative answers have already been reflected in the section on criticisms and handicaps, but here we shall emphasize areas where more was anticipated than delivered.

If there was one area that received greater emphasis than others it was the application of computer technology to librarianship. Some library schools offer little or nothing in this area, and even where courses in computer science, programming, and the like are available in the institution but outside the library school, far too little use is made of them (perhaps a reflection of the inflexibility earlier noted). The criticism, however, cuts to the heart of the basic problem of what library education should consist of. If contemporary library practice is the key, then clearly most libraries (the small and medium-size public and college and virtually all school libraries) have little if any contact with computerization, and library schools will feel little responsibility for training their students in this discipline. So much more needs to be said about the content of library education that we shall defer consideration until later. Here it need only be noted that many foreign (to say nothing of American) students were disappointed at the lack of or limited instruction in this particular area.

Another disappointment was expressed by some who came to an American school after having had some basic library training in their home countries; they found themselves repeating much of the work already taken and without the opportunity to go beyond.

But even many who had not already had basic training reacted unfavorably to the courses they took, finding them superficial, dealing with matters that could readily be mastered on the job, or with reference tools that had become familiar through undergraduate study or through library use. All this underscores the difficulty the library school itself faces, in trying to reconcile a common program with an audience of widely diversified maturity and experience. Still, enough dissatisfaction has been expressed to warrant a hard look at what is taught, its necessity, its contribution, and the elements that might be eliminated without loss.

The shallowness or superficiality of library training was criticized by a considerable number; time and again there was disappointment at the lack of opportunity to apply what was taught in class. This usually took the form of frustration because of failure to assign practice work; even when it was provided it was considered too limited to contribute effectively to one's training. Sometimes the need was expressed for more practice in general; others specified more practice in L.C. classification, or in cataloging, or in handling non-book materials, or in reference work. Whether or not library schools can or should return to the assignment of practice work in libraries, a procedure fairly common even in the 1920's and earlier, it is difficult to say. The year of work one may do in a local school, public, or college library is a far cry from the carefully organized intern program at the Library of Congress. The problems of supervision, to see that a real learning experience is provided rather than humdrum activity, and to arrange for some diversity of experience, are not easy to cope with, even where, as in large urban centers, a wide variety of libraries exists; and the opportunities are extremely limited in a small college community where so many library schools are located. Again, however, it is a question of what library education is for; until this is clearly perceived it is fruitless to suggest a method (which is all that practice work is, anyway) for reaching the goal. But this may sound like a quibble; the students asking for practice work want to see the connection between the ivory tower (classroom) and the field of operations. Practice work may not be the only answer or even the best one—especially in the light of disappointments that the typical practice work in the past has engendered.

A number of specific needs were mentioned, their solutions hoped for but unfulfilled, among them the expectation of greater attention to research methods; more on documentation; organization and methods of library operation in countries other than the United States; more training in audio-visual materials; better preparation for library management, including budget construction and handling of personnel problems. Clearly some of these matters are dealt with in some library schools, though with varying competence and thoroughness; nevertheless, some disappointments are inevitable, and it is unrealistic to expect any school to anticipate every problem likely to be brought by every student, foreign or American, and to provide proper solutions.

We conclude this section with two quotations, the first from India and the second from Nigeria:

> "I expected to get more from the training. In fact, I expected to get an education rather than a training. The courses were more descriptive and opinion oriented rather than quantitative and analytical. Mathematical thinking in the social sciences has not been incorporated in the curriculum."

> "I had expected to get much more. Maybe that was because of a wrong assumption on my part that since the U.S. is a world power most of the courses would have a world-wide outlook. It was difficult to reconcile my assumption with my courses in reference work, cataloging, etc., where the approach was provincial."

4. Was the method of teaching different from that in your own country? Were you able to adjust to it, or was adjustment difficult? (For example, too much lecturing, too much reading required, too much class discussion, too much written work, not enough individual attention from the faculty, etc.)

In view of the diversity of countries from which the foreign students came, it is hardly surprising that the answers ranged from "no difference" to very considerable difference. But even when the differences were extreme adjustments apparently were readily made. Difficulties arose not so much from variation in teaching methods as in limitations in English, so that lectures were sometimes difficult to absorb, reading assignments too heavy to keep up with, and written reports imposed a mental and physical strain. Aside from this, however, the complaints echoed those of American students: dull lectures, monotonous readings, uninspiring and repetitious and unnecessary courses.

The difference in teaching method repeatedly noted, especially by students from the Orient but not limited to them, was the extensive reading requirement in place of the formal lecture-plus-prescribed-text. Many found it quite impossible to read everything on a prescribed (or suggested) list, with consequent worry and frustration. Some commented that too much was expected in too short a time—possibly a reflection of difficulties with the language, or misinterpretation of the reading assignment, or, indeed, an all too accurate reporting of excessive reading requirements.

A second difficulty was the discussion method. Here the language handicap plus a natural reticence to speak up before faculty and fellow-students inevitably led to difficulties in participation. Discussion as such, however, was generally favorably received. One Chinese student commented: "In the society based on Confucian ethics and moral judgment, discussion is hardly the channel for learning and the orthodox textbooks or syllabi served as the required readings; sometimes the only ones. I do like the Western way to search for truth through controversy and discussion."

Clearly, discussions, like lectures, may vary from valuable to trivial; the "method" depends on the sophistication, imagination, intelligence, and seriousness of the discussants, guided by a knowledgeable teacher. Inevitably many discussion periods are a complete waste of time. One Korean may have written more accurately than he realized: "Class discussion was dominated by American students. Therefore I learned less because I always listened rather than talked."

The examination system also came in for criticism, not because it was different but because it was considered ineffective or inferior. Particular exception was taken to the objective (e.g., multiple-choice) examination, preference expressed for the essay. One Englishman wrote: "We are used to writing essays rather than taking quizzes and so-called objective tests. Essays are, of course, more difficult for the examiner to grade." The criticisms were reminiscent of those frequently made both inside and outside library schools, and one person noted that such an examination revealed nothing of one's ability to think logically or to react incisively to any particular issue.

The amount of written work required was often considered excessive; though this judgment probably results from lack of fluency in written English, it may also come from American students, and both groups may feel that the results do not warrant the effort required to complete the assignment. In fact, one respondent considered written assignments as a device to help the teacher complete some work on which she was engaged, and the only reaction received consisted of spelling and grammatical corrections.

Finally, the question of individual attention from the faculty evoked answers ranging from none at all to as much as needed. It is difficult to say how this would compare with conditions at home. In most countries it is doubtful if the individual attention to the student even equals that given in the United States, however limited the latter may be. One student from South Africa noted that the American teachers were more approachable; on the other hand, one from Singapore found the faculty-student relationship discouraging and he even suspected some faculty prejudice against foreign students.

The following excerpts emphasize the points made by many who commented on teaching methods, as well as bringing out some unique observations. A mature student from Austria wrote:

> "Teaching methods are very different and some are painful in adjustment. American higher education and library schools take the student by the hand and lead him day and night. There is little freedom, and I still remember my astonishment when I was part of the following conversation: 'You are reading an interesting book. For whom do you read it?' One is not expected to read a book for himself, but always for a course."

At the other extreme, there was the comment from a Cuban refugee:

> "The teaching was quite different, perhaps because we were overloaded with work and readings, and it was necessary to learn much very quickly. I would have liked some time to study on my own the things I was interested in knowing."

The lecture/class discussion method brought this reaction from a student from China:

> "At home teachers do most of the lecturing. But in the states students take an active part in class discussion. I like this method, but at first it was very hard for me and other foreign students to participate because using

> another language we could not react quickly, and before we had time to construct our sentences our American classmates had already expressed the 'bright ideas' we had intended to say.

The discussion method, however, did serve to reveal limitations in background or comprehension on the part of students, though this may be a reflection of limitations in the teacher, or in the content of the courses. An Israeli librarian, particularly interested in medical librarianship, commented pertinently on this point:

> "During class discussions it struck me that American librarians in general lack a broader view of basic library science. It seems as if they are satisfied with technical know-how exclusively. When facet classification was mentioned, nobody in class knew or remembered exactly what it meant. During and after the international congress in Amsterdam in 1969, I noticed that many American colleagues had no idea how much the UDC was used in medical libraries."

The distaste with certain aspects of instruction was well expressed by a student from Scotland. It is of course impossible to say how widespread in American library schools are the conditions described:

> "Methods of teaching: It was, I think, at this point that I found myself most ill-prepared and adjustment proved most difficult. Both in final years at school and throughout my university career, class attendance was optional and the main emphasis was on independent study, with the main bulk of teaching done in tutorial groups of four or five. It was therefore a considerable shock to find on starting the library science courses that almost all classes were conducted in lecture style and were compulsory, with attendance taken at each meeting, and sanctions imposed on those who were absent for any reason other than sickness. It was a kind of regimentation I had not encountered since junior school days, and I reacted very negatively."

The last quotation includes a moving tribute to one teacher from a Chinese student who experienced considerable difficulty in adjusting:

> "The types of tests and examinations were the most difficult to adjust to. Since the classes were large (sometimes as many as 130) it was impossible to expect individual attention from the faculty. But I shall never forget one professor who always advised me and told me not to worry. She once told me she did not know how she could manage if she went to China because she thought she could never learn Chinese to compare with my English. At that time this was a priceless comfort and sympathy and meant a lot to me, alone and far away from family, home and country."

5. MOST IMPORTANT: Were you able to make use of your library school preparation in your subsequent career? If not, was this because of the failure of the library school, or for other reasons?

With this question we come to the heart of the inquiry. The question itself is not easy to answer, not only because of the difficulty of showing the relation between preparation and practice but even more of knowing the factors in one's background that are directly related to subsequent events.

A distinction also must be made between the application of skills and activities requiring judgment. One may develop habits through practice (e.g., typewriting) but judgment of what to do in a given circumstance bears no relation to habit. We can no more trace a causal relation though it may exist, between library education and the exercise of critical judgment in library operations than we can between a broad general education and subsequent conduct as a citizen or human being. We shall later have more to say on the nature of library education, but now we shall address ourselves to the relation seen by foreign students between their American library school experience and the use they were able to make of it.

For library school graduates who remained and took positions in the United States, one would expect a high degree of application, since instruction in the American school is largely keyed to American library practice and conditions. There are of course exceptions, particularly where the position called for competence beyond the library school's ability to prepare for it; an example would be Far Eastern bibliography, or possibly the application of cataloging rules to books in non-Western languages. But by and large one may anticipate a relation between preparation and subsequent practice in American libraries. Surprisingly, however, when we examine the reactions of those who have returned to the home countries, there also is a very strong positive reaction; the American experience was considered relevant and useful in their careers.

The nature of this contribution necessarily varies with the particular country and the individuals. But based on the testimony of the respondents who wrote from abroad, American library training provided knowledge that could be applied directly in library organization and techniques. This was particularly true in countries that had been influenced by American education and library practice; e.g., the Philippines, or where American practice had enough in common with British so that libraries which followed British practice could readily absorb the technical contribution that an American-trained librarian could provide (e.g., Australia).

A second type of contribution is less easy to specify. This was the inculcation of a broad comprehension of library organization and focus in the interest of reading and scholarship, so that the "disciple" might apply it as opportunity afforded. In this sense the contribution is potential rather than actual, but not only that, for several passed on the ideas, the knowledge, that they had gained to others through lectures and particularly through teaching. One student from Japan wrote that he had conducted an in-service training program for members of his library staff and had also taught Bibliography of Science and Technology in a course for librarians. Another, from the Philippines, was able to teach a course in Chemical bibliography. And still others have taken full-time positions as library school administrators or faculty members, and have thus been in a position to inculcate some of the American teachings into their own programs. Everywhere there have been adaptations to domestic conditions. One student from India wrote that his American experience led him to introduce changes in syllabi of library science courses "suited to Indian conditions"; another, from Israel, wrote that sophisticated cataloging rules had to be simplified for application in her school library.

There is of course a negative side—either a categorical "No" answer or one sufficiently limited to be considered "No". By some, failure to make use of library school preparation was attributed to shortcomings in the school's curriculum; but more recognized that conditions locally were such that the American preparation was largely irrelevant. How apply library training in a setting where libraries do not exist? Or even where there are libraries, the opportunities for obtaining a position were so limited that the applicant was forced into another line of work. Thus, one Filipino wrote: "The failure was not the library school's. The position for which I sought training was already filled. Right now I am using part of the training I received in my English classes."

From Czechoslovakia came the observation that the library education program which he had taken paid little if any attention to documentation, the respondent's current activity, but he hoped to be able in a future library position to apply some principles he had learned. A Canadian stated that he used much of his training, "but not as much had the program been more rigorous." But most of those who found fault recognized that some courses had value for them, other courses none at all.

The failure of the national setting, resulting in the lack of demand for, hence supply of, libraries was infrequently noted, but it is surely widespread. It is unrealistic to expect to find a sophisticated library movement in a country dominated by illiteracy, or where education is limited to a small minority, or where living conditions are so primitive that they need attention before libraries can be taken seriously. It seems foolish to decry the absence of libraries where economic and social conditions militate against them, and it is completely unrealistic to expect library training, wherever given or however adaptable, to make much of a dent. However, not many foreign students have come from such countries.

Three comments from Indonesia emphasize the inability to apply library training on return, but in each case the training was considered of some value:

> "Whatever the inability to apply all of my training, this was not because of a failure of the library school. Rather, it is because of the local situation. I am required to do everything and I have no time for research. My training has been useful in my teaching in Djakarta."

> "Different circumstances at home and in the U.S. have made it hard to justify my previous library training in the U.S. But it was a very good experience, and helpful to me now."

> "I have not been able to make full use of my library school training. This is not because of the library school, but the library in which I am now working is not ready for me. Perhaps in ten years, perhaps never."

One Indian wrote that he had been able to make only limited use of his training, but this he attributed to the kind of library (unidentified) in which he worked rather than to the library school he attended. And another from the same country was completely negative: "I did not learn anything more than I already knew."

Many Americans, especially those with some library experience, would undoubtedly echo that sentiment. And few could take issue with those respondents who, without minimizing their formal library training, would still claim that they received their real competence through practical experience, either prior or subsequent to their library school careers.

6. What changes in the program would you suggest, especially for foreign students?

To a very considerable extent the answers to this question are previsioned in the reactions to the questions already discussed. Particularly the questions dealing with handicaps and shortcomings, expectations, applications, and teaching procedures all touch areas where some changes would be welcomed. But once more it should be noted that there was a considerable range in the responses; some said that no changes at all should be made, and especially none for the benefit of the foreign student, that the program was fine as given. Others were less enthusiastic and pointed out areas with considerable room for improvement, in this respect sounding very much like the American students who have recently voiced their dissatisfactions and frustrations.

A considerable number reflected the sense of loss and puzzlement on first stepping on an American campus. There was not only the strangeness, the difficulty of finding one's way, of coping with institutional regulations, but the bafflement in coming to terms with the American way of doing things. Perhaps the outstanding example is the discussion in place of lecture; another is the extensive reading assignment instead of the prescribed textbook. In time such obstacles may be overcome, albeit sometimes with difficulty, but others are not so easily assuaged. These are, broadly, a lack of comprehension of American life and culture. The hope expressed by a Paraguayan for "a better knowledge of American culture, history, and language" typifies a lack expressed by many, who felt that some orientation along such lines, early in the foreign student's visit to the United States, would be welcome. Many students also felt that orientation directly keyed to the particular institution they were attending and especially to the program of library education—goals, requirements, methods, examinations, etc.—would have removed some irritating problems and thus have facilitated the process of adaptation.

Along with orientation, some hope was expressed that the regulations might be bent somewhat in recognition of their possible inapplicability to a foreign student. Is the foreign language requirement, usually French or German, realistic? One Filipino observed that "English was hard enough!" Another, an Indian, saw no justification for the Graduate Record Examination for students from abroad. But adaptations were most strongly emphasized in connection with the curriculum (see also discussion under questions 2 and 3). Frequently mentioned in this connection was the desire for a course in comparative (or international) librarianship. This reflects, on the part of some, a wish to learn more about librarianship in areas other than the United States, the opportunity to compare practices in one country with those in another, and to learn why differences are inevitable in light of variations in social conditions. Others saw such a course in a more limited sense—a desire to specialize in library structure and practice in, say, Japan or India or wherever. But what was wanted even more than a special course was the incorporation of foreign language bibliographies and foreign library applications in the courses regularly offered. The following comments are illustrative:

> Eliminate the strictly American material and make courses more general. (Turkey)
>
> More attention should be paid to British literature of librarianship. (Australia)
>
> At least one course should devote attention to foreign books: problems, development, industry, organizations (Libya)
>
> Practice given in cataloging and classification is oriented to the U.S. and is not applicable abroad. It would be preferable to stress theoretical and comparative studies of major classification schemes and cataloging rules. (Japan)
>
> Courses should refer to materials and systems outside the U.S. (Colombia)

> Provide opportunity to learn book selection procedures and bibliographies for foreign students, and show them their role in compiling a national bibliography. (Nigeria)
>
> Study other systems of cataloging and classification; e.g., the Universal Decimal Classification. (Cuba)
>
> Much more work on reference sources and techniques, to include non-American materials as well, to acquaint students with reference tools in languages other than English. (Scotland)
>
> The reference courses which to us were simply a bore could have been of more advantage if we had been given more choice of attacking the problem or maybe allowed to search for non-English reference tools more than just the standard American reference tools. (Iceland)

As earlier noted, many expressed a wish for practice work or internship. In some cases it was felt that the whole program would be more meaningful if the students came with some background in library practice (a sort of pre-internship). A correspondent from Singapore thought this would help foreign students "to appreciate some of the courses they might otherwise not enjoy, e.g., cataloging and classification." An Israeli commented:

> The selection of students from foreign countries should favor those who are already well acquainted with librarianship in their own countries. This is important for two reasons: someone who leaves a well-established position in his country for a stay in the U.S. has a more mature and professional approach and is better able to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by good American library schools. On the other hand, he may be more reluctant to leave his country permanently for the larger professional community and more exciting opportunities of the U.S., in spite of the fact that the temptation to do so might be very great. The attractions of America are numerous, especially for people from countries which can ill afford to lose their professional elite; it is precisely to these people that the U.S. has most to offer. It seems to me that the relatively inexperienced graduate may not benefit to the same extent from the training he receives and may not be able to adapt his experience should he go back.

Whether or not they would agree with this observation, many more students wanted the opportunity to apply what they presumably had been taught, as an intern in an American library. And, of course, many remained.

A number of interesting observations were made about the need for more individual attention, for greater competence in the foreign student advisor, and about the desirability of assigning American students to serve as tutors or aids to foreign students. And repeatedly the wish was expressed for some preliminary training in English.

Finally, there were a number of highly suggestive ideas, even though their bearing on library school programs was peripheral. Faculty exchanges with foreign library schools were encouraged, as well as some affiliation with overseas schools, calling for the exchange of teaching materials as well as teachers. (India) Obviously desirable but difficult to prescribe were changes in attitude of some faculty members toward foreign students, to try to understand their problems including language difficulties (Brazil). Another thought that the attitude of some that "foreign students don't know anything" was certainly in need of revision. (Nigeria) The provincial attitude of some American librarians was neatly scored by one student who wrote:

> "It would be nice and helpful even for American librarians to hear that there are libraries and even good ones outside the U.S. I would have loved to hear maybe once that there are other people besides U.S. citizens that are civilized and read books even though their library systems may not be as developed as are the U.S. library systems."

The wish to eliminate the thesis requirement where it still exists would surely strike a responsive chord in many, whatever their nationality. One student, from tropical Africa, hoped some attention might be paid to problems of book preservation, e.g., combatting mould in tropical countries and deterioration of book bindings. A southern European pleaded, "Less psychology and sociology, please!" On the other hand, more than one student hoped that the way could be opened to permit courses outside the library school; e.g., "Since most foreign students have a specialty in their native languages and cultural background, training should be focussed on interdisciplinary studies. They should be trained as specialists of certain cultural or geographical concentrations." (China) Many who were generally satisfied with the curriculum thought that independent thinking rather than routine mastery should be the goal; and in place of learning "the corpus of bare facts in Western context, and cram them up," a study of the implications for library development of literacy and book production and availability in various countries. (India) There was considerable feeling that no special changes for foreign students were necessary or even desirable. One student from Hong Kong commented:

> "If the library school has to make concessions and changes for foreign students, then the sound principles of its very existence should be re-examined. Foreign students should have proficiency in English language, and some prerequisite courses on the undergraduate level."

A student from The Netherlands recognized that education for librarianship could not be divorced from the future of libraries themselves. She wrote:

> "The changes in the program are dependent upon the future of the profession. As long as librarians themselves do not know what they want to be, how can the library schools expect to adequately prepare the students for their job? For foreign students I would recommend a greater emphasis on courses dealing with automation and administrative (management) techniques and the various cataloging systems."

Ultimately, the suggestions for change shake down to two major types: changes desirable for foreign students, and changes desirable for everyone. Of these the second is by far the more important. It involves the central consideration of education for librarianship as an intellectual discipline, worthy of a place in a university, as against the mastery of skills that may be better learned on the job.

7. Did you have any information about the university you were going to attend before coming to America? Do you think you would have found such information of value? Did you actually know much about the library school before you arrived?

8. How did you happen to select the library school you attended?

The responses to these questions were about what might have been expected. Most who commented knew little or nothing about the university they subsequently attended, although in some cases the reputation held some attraction. Whether preliminary knowledge would have made any difference, either in choice or ease of adapting to it, is doubtful; some thought such information would have been useful but this, of course, is highly speculative. The selection of a library school was almost arbitrary, conditioned not so much, if at all, by the quality or reputation of the school as by its making financial aid available through scholarships, or by being the first among the prospective schools to accept the applicant. If there was any basis for preferring a particular school, it was the recommendation of others who had attended or knew about it, or the reputation of the parent institution.

In some cases the library school had been selected by a sponsoring or clearinghouse agency, e.g., the Institute of International Education, or by a national embassy. One student based his choice on his acquaintance with a library periodical published by the school; others (very few, however) were attracted by the presence of certain individuals on the faculty. Some were looking for a particular program, such as theological or medical or law or school librarianship, and made their selection accordingly. In a number of cases the decision was based on tuition charges. And some students picked their school because a husband or relatives were near or at the same institution.

American students who are familiar with the quarter or semester calendar can readily understand the scheduling and course-hour system, but to the foreign student this may be confusing. One student from Australia wrote that "most foreign students would appreciate a detailed brochure which explains the American educational system; e.g., what does a credit hour mean? Also Immigration Department regulations concerning work in the U.S., e.g., pointing out that accepting paid work as a part-time teaching assistant or research assistant is not contrary to work regulations." Probably most library schools have student manuals available, and these could be sent to foreign students before their coming; with this a supplement might be sent with particular reference to their interests and problems, to serve as a sort of vade mecum. Whether or not such manuals can ameliorate most difficulties, they should help some students even though others will remain puzzled and exasperated. One from China wrote that in seeking a library school he "disregarded schools which required lengthy procedures—reference letters, physical exams, financial statement, application fee, biography and other unreasonable requirements". Another, from Singapore, decided to attend the first school that accepted him; "I was so fed up with the application formalities and delay of some other schools that I did not bother to wait for their replies."

One student suggested that a select reading list for each course might be sent in advance, as "these characterize a course better than most descriptions."

Finally, a Korean listed several considerations which entered into his choice of a library school; as these in one form or another were mentioned by many others they are here listed:

(a) The school was fully accredited; (b) no previous training was required, and the course could be completed in one year; (c) no foreign language other than English was required for foreign students; (d) the tuition was less than elsewhere; (e) there was no thesis requirement; (f) the school maintained a placement service; and (g) each student could choose his own faculty advisor.

As every library school administrator knows, sometimes his own institution has trouble in interpreting transcripts from foreign universities. One student from Switzerland pointed out the difficulty she had had because of this, and stated that "in the end it was the university senate who decided that my qualifications were beyond doubt."

COMMENTARY

The comments from foreign graduates reveal great diversity, from complete satisfaction with their library school experience to severe criticism and disappointment. In view of the variations in library schools, of variations in background and maturity of the students, of variations in library possibilities and developments from one country to another, it would be unrealistic to expect anything else.

Whether or not, and to what extent, any library school can mitigate the dissatisfactions, or improve its program to meet the criticisms, depends on a number of considerations, among them (1) its overall aims, (2) its faculty (size and character), (3) its financial resources. Where obstacles are inherent in the students themselves (e.g., limited facility in English, or lack of knowledge of American government or backgrounds) there is little the school can do; where these are severe enough to militate against mastery of the program—and where they can be detected in advance—the students should be discouraged from coming and even refused admission if they insist on coming.

However, enough dissatisfaction has been expressed by those without such handicaps—indeed, even more by American students—to warrant serious attention to the library school program itself and its administration. Here, four points emerge with particular clarity:

(1) The importance of flexibility. Though all schools must inevitably establish certain basic requirements, it should not be too difficult to waive some of them where the student can demonstrate sufficient familiarity with the content of some courses, obtained through previous study or experience. This of course is easier prescribed than put into practice; transcripts and personal testimony—even examinations—may not reveal what a student really knows—or, perhaps worse, they may suggest a competence that does not exist. Under the circumstances schools prefer to err on the side of uniform application of the rules, but surely it should not be too difficult to adjust some rules for some students on the basis of common sense.

(2) The need for curriculum development or expansion. Even without a drastic overhaul of the program, library schools should seriously consider certain changes in present courses and the addition of others. Undoubtedly many courses, keyed to American practice and conditions, tend to be somewhat parochial in skimping or even ignoring methods and materials of prime importance to the foreign library. However reference work and bibliography are taught, some attention should certainly be devoted to foreign-language materials. (This, incidentally, is no less important for the American than for the foreign student.) The teaching of cataloging and classification might go beyond the Anglo-American code and the D.C. and L.C. systems, but how far—UDC, Colon, Bliss? And are faculty

members themselves prepared to teach such systems? In fact, if they are taught at all it may preferably be done in separate or special courses. Two other curricular areas should be mentioned: library automation particularly as applied to information retrieval, and comparative librarianship. These areas, especially the first, are important to American students as well as foreign, and the second would undoubtedly be valuable in giving all students a sense of perspective and a basis for applying techniques and broad developments [e.g., networks] in countries now without them.

(3) Teaching methods. Repeated expressions of exasperation with memorization of details—forgotten with the end of the course, especially when no opportunity has been afforded to apply memory rather than judgment—are probably justified; any teacher should ask himself what, pedagogically, is gained that might not be better learned in some other way—on the assumption that it is worth learning. The same observation might be made about other teaching methods. Much has been made, for example, of the discussion method, but as every teacher knows, the method may be simply a device to permit articulate (and often ill-prepared) students to express their favorite ideas, or to ride a particular hobby. The method to be truly effective requires firm control and direction. But in the last analysis method is secondary to content, and the basic consideration is how best to inculcate the content so that it acquires real meaning to the students.

(4) Practice work or internship. So many respondents expressed a wish for practical experience as part of the training that some thought might again be given to it. But as noted earlier, the practice assignment must be so carefully planned to be effective, to say nothing of the availability of a variety of libraries willing to co-operate, that it is not easy to arrange. Some compromise might be effected through assignments that require some library visits and observation; and especially through assignments which simulate a real library situation. It is unnecessary to review the reasons why practice or internship has been given up, but apparently with its loss has gone a value which present library school teaching, at least in many schools, has not replaced.

Whatever point there may be to these observations, they are subordinate to the major and overriding question: What should education for librarianship, for American and foreign students alike, consist of? The question is perennial and will continue to be asked, and no answer is likely to be universally satisfactory. But in groping for it we may make some progress toward establishing library education as a truly intellectual discipline, and to this problem we next turn.

FOOTNOTES

1. This figure underestimates the number of foreign graduates; it reflects the responses from 40 of the 50 American accredited library schools, and the graduates of unaccredited library schools are not included at all. For a single term (Fall 1969) the number enrolled in 43 accredited (including 3 in Canada) and 14 non-accredited library schools was 540. (Data collected by Piggford)

2. In this connection it is somewhat ironical to read the comment of Neal Harlow, formerly dean of the Graduate School of Library Service of Rutgers:

   "Graduate education...is concerned with theory, principles, and concepts, and the individual student is expected to understand and be able to use his knowledge independently, not commit details to memory and repeat them upon request." (in George S. Bonn, ed., Library Education and Training in Developing Countries, p. 48.)

III. A CONCEPTION OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP

The present inquiry began with a focus on the foreign student—the extent to which his American library school experience could be related to his subsequent career. But it has become evident that the question as initially conceived was much too superficial; that the real question is whether or not a library school program can be organized with a content that may have relatively little to do with daily operations of a given library, but which may have quite a lot to do with the way it operates as an institution, with an understanding of the library as a social and cultural instrumentality, and with the future of library development.

But even if we think of preparation for library work in a strictly instrumental sense, it is fruitless to expect any school to offer a program that will turn out "instant" librarians who can step into a library and carry on as if they had always been there and were fully attuned to its way of doing things. This is true for American as well as foreign students. No library school can turn out full-fledged practitioners at graduation. The best any school can hope for is that its graduates are capable of becoming librarians—librarians of vision and imagination, persons able to adapt their theoretical backgrounds to a practical situation. With a solid background of theory and principle, they should be able to adapt themselves to the practices of all but the most specialized kind of library. The real distinction that library schools must make is between apprenticeship to a craft and preparation for a profession. It now becomes necessary to spell out somewhat broadly a conception of what professional library education might consist of.

Anyone at all familiar with library literature knows that there is no shortage of prescription. From the days of Melvil Dewey to the present, library theorists and administrators have speculated, their conclusions ranging from a position that no library education at all was needed to one advocating a program beginning in the undergraduate years and continuing well beyond. All argument resolves itself into the questions of what the education is for, what it should consist of, and how effective it has been or is likely to be.

Dewey of course was severely practical in his conception. He knew what librarianship as practiced in late-19th century was all about, and he developed a curriculum that would prepare his students to step unhesitatingly from classroom to the workaday world of the library. Some of the details sound somewhat quaint today (mastery of the library hand is the familiar example), but no one can deny that the early schools that operated on the Dewey pattern turned out competent practitioners and progenitors of other schools who had a firm and beneficent impact on the library profession in the next century.

But conditions changed. Libraries today are different from those in Dewey's day and the kind of person aspiring to become a librarian has also changed. The library today, bending and adjusting to the needs of contemporary society and scholarship, is a far more complex institution—look at even the same library a hundred, or even fifty, years apart, to realize that the training envisaged by Dewey has a good deal less to contribute today. Furthermore, and perhaps even more significant, the aspiring or apprentice librarian comes to the profession with a considerably broader educational armament than his peers of an earlier day. Of the 20 graduates of Columbia's first library school class, only 5 were college graduates; the others could not even be accepted today in any accredited library school. Undoubtedly much of the content included in the early curriculum could be learned on the job, and this is true of much that makes up the typical library school program today. This is not to imply that the library school has lost its reason for being; but the school must move far beyond Dewey's conception if it is to justify itself as representing an intellectual discipline and particularly if it is to be worthy of a place in a university.

For present purposes it is unnecessary to trace the changes in the curriculum that have taken place, nor to identify the variations in program and method of library schools today. The interesting thing is that the differences from one school to another seem to make little difference in the ability of their graduates to adapt themselves to the library in which they find themselves. This may be more a tribute to the individual than to the training he has received. On the other hand, it may mean, in certain positions at least, that the library school program was not designed with such positions in mind. For example, courses in library history, or in communications, can have little bearing on one's competence to perform certain tasks in a library regardless of their importance for other purposes. But other courses may be decidedly relevant; it seems almost inconceivable that a sound preparation in cataloging or in reference procedures will not have a carryover in subsequent library positions. But suppose one takes a library position that does not call for such competence—say, as a special or children's librarian or as an administrator—should such a person have had the training in cataloging and reference? One answer usually given is that the student can rarely know in advance what his future position will be; better that he be prepared for more than he can use than that he be caught short. In any event, one can hardly conceive of a program so loosely constructed that students may pick and choose as spirit or preference dictates; there must be a solid core even though the ultimate result is vocational.

There is, however, another answer. The library school should develop in students "their full potential for critical and incisive thinking, particularly in areas concerning the goals of libraries, their role in society, their history, and their future."[1] This is not the only goal of Chicago's school; three others are given: "(2) to prepare students for a professional career in librarianship; (3) to further the state of the art of communicating recorded knowledge through theoretical, historical, and experimental research; and (4) to provide a philosophy for education in librarianship."[2] This is not a prescription for all schools, but the first would seem basic to any school that aspired to more than vocationalism. Indeed, this purpose is not antithetical, but rather complementary, to the vocational. No less important, it offers a basis for developing a curriculum with intellectual content and sufficiently broad to offer the potential librarian a sound basis regardless of the particular kind of library or type of library activity in which he is likely to engage.

This, however, is but the beginning of the problem; it remains to spell out these aims in a curriculum, and a common curriculum cannot, and need not, be prescribed. There are questions of interpretation, of scheduling, of teaching method, of university or college regulations, etc. Still, if there can be general agreement on the main thrust of the goals suggested above we shall be on the way to developing a curriculum relevant to them.

Professor Abraham Kaplan approaches library education by raising the question of public expectations of the library—what people want it to be and do—a question that everyone concerned with the matter is inevitably forced to ask.[3] He bases his answer on what libraries have done in the past and presumably will continue to do. The functions of the library are seen as threefold. First, it acts as an archive or repository of what has been investigated in the past; "the library is for society," he says, "what memory is for the individual, the repository of what has already been learned, including what has been badly learned or mislearned." Secondly, it is a means of education, "an instrumentality by which certain groups and classes in the society can take advantage of experiences not directly their own, and so improve their position in society." The third function is to serve as an instrument of research—to provide the knowledge already known and recorded to enable the creation of new knowledge. (Professor Kaplan makes the useful distinction between research and "re-search", which is merely the repetition of knowledge already available, and which more properly belongs in the second, or educational, function.)

There is certainly nothing very novel about Professor Kaplan's formulation; others may offer theirs, in greater detail and with numerous sub-divisions, but the essence and justification of libraries are clearly seen in the functions enumerated. But there still remains the question of how the potential librarian is to be prepared for these functions. Professor Kaplan does not spell out a curriculum; instead he visualizes the kind of person who is necessary to perform the library functions suggested. He should be one acquainted with the uses and users of information. Kaplan believes that "sometime in the course of training, whether as an undergraduate or in the graduate library school itself, the student will have been exposed to something of the sociology of knowledge, to something of the history of ideas, and to something of the structure of inquiry...in broad historical and cultural terms." Nor is this all. "I would think," he continues, "that an inculcation of a love of learning, of the love of ideas, of the love of truth, and even of the love of books, is an entirely appropriate part of the training in this profession." Undoubtedly this is true, but it might well be part of the training of anyone who aspires to the status of an educated person. It is questionable if a library school can realistically repair the limitations of formal general education; on the other hand, it should look for these qualities in its applicants, whether or not they are revealed by formal examination.[4]

Beyond this humanistic base Kaplan sees the vocational element, learning "how" things are done, and he also sees a true intellectual basis as lying in logic, linguistics, mathematics, theory of information, all grouped together as "metasciences". These are important not because of their relation to the burgeoning field of automation and computer technology, but because "central to them [is] the concept of structure, of order, of form...precisely the central concern of library science."

This conception of the librarian is a far cry from the practitioner engaged in the daily tasks familiar to all, but it is a conception of a true professional, and of a profession with true intellectual underpinnings. Professor Robert Hayes, approaching library education from another tack—systems design—makes this distinction quite explicit.[5] He sees current library education as concerned "with particulars, with techniques as they are used in existing library environments...The result, at the worst, is the education of a set of well-trained clerks... At the best, the creative minds will be able to remold the solutions developed in the past, will be able to adjust them better to meet a new environment, but in doing so will be constrained to the familiar paths." (p. 53) But even at best, though this might work well for a typical public library, it does not "meet the needs of new information environments or the needs of growth in understanding of the library profession itself," and for these Hayes sees the need for developing a methodology for systems design. In short, an education which may be irrelevant to many libraries, particularly as they function today, but indispensable in an instrumental sense to the future library and justifiable as an intellectual discipline in its own right.

The application of much of the above to a library school curriculum was developed in a comprehensive paper from a Canadian respondent. He recognized the necessity for the mastery of "skills", preferably through rigorous internship training, but since this is not now provided—or presently practicable—the inculcation of such skills must be the responsibility of the library school. The skills are the familiar ones, readily identified through the titles of library school courses—cataloging, classification, reference, book selection, etc. But skills though necessary are not sufficient, and he next comes to grips with the so-called theoretical areas; topics not immediately related to daily operations but essential in the background and future of the professional librarian. Here he is influenced by much of Kaplan's argument, especially his reference to the "metasciences", and also by Foskett's approach to the study of classification and subject analysis. For much of what Kaplan in particular prescribes it would be necessary to go beyond the library school to the university at large—for mathematics, linguistics, information theory, etc.; or, where the larger institution itself does not offer relevant courses, specialists may be brought to the library school, not for isolated or incidental lectures, but to conduct formal courses.

This conceptual formulation of a curriculum has little in common with the programs of library schools as they have developed to the present time. The emphasis historically has been and today is on the mastery of skills, yet as the criticisms make clear, this has not been altogether successful. The wish has been repeatedly expressed for more practice work, precisely the type of intern-training advocated in the preceding paragraph. The historical and theoretical elements have undoubtedly appeared to some extent in many, possibly all, programs, but in most cases the treatment has been superficial and very far from the "metascientific" (Kaplan) or systems design (Hayes) approach.

Before raising the question of what can be done to remove, or alleviate, the weaknesses in library school programs, we may note one or two other prescriptions. Since many of the complaints from American students revolve around the word "relevance", it is not surprising that curriculum changes are keyed to making the program more "relevant" to society with all its disparate elements and groups, without necessarily surrendering the obligation to scholarship and the preservational function. A few schools have introduced new courses—or even an entire program—to prepare for service to the underprivileged; more common is the introduction of new material in the current program with particular reference to the disadvantaged. However, one library school director, Guy Garrison, has recently proposed a thoroughgoing overhaul, and he suggests a new program which he considers geared to modern urban life.[6]

Even though he is somewhat scornful of the present program ("Much of the technical and rote-learning content can be dropped. Cataloging can go."), he still retains it under the caption "Basic library education (followed by work-study)"; though he does not say what this is, he probably has some form of internship or practice work in libraries in mind. However, the innovations appear with his listing of areas which should make up library education:

Techniques of community organization
Urban planning
Economics of public service
Intergovernmental relations
Communication theory
Group dynamics

As to whether or not such a program would develop better librarians one can only speculate. Still, it is worth noting not only what is added but what is omitted. Added is a large component of sociology and political science; omitted, with the possible exception of communication theory, are the metasciences (though these may be studied outside the library school), history, systems planning and design. Also, though the point is only incidental, one may wonder about the "relevance" of such a program to the foreign student, or even to the American student who does not become a public librarian.

Though the formulations proposed for library school curriculum reform would scarcely be greeted with favor by all library schools, to say nothing of all librarians, the present curriculum would be, and has been, accorded even greater hostility; relatively few are satisfied with it, and, paradoxically, library school faculties probably least of all. Regardless of specific course organization and content, however, it should not be difficult to arrive at general agreement on certain desiderata of library education—transmitting to incipient librarians a grounding in practices that have fairly well stood the test of time, but, no less important, preparing them for institutional and social changes as social needs and demands suggest. As one approach to this end we shall borrow from discussions of curricular structure at the University of Chicago.

Though the School believes that not all students need to be exposed to a common curriculum, it considers certain areas sufficiently basic to be part of the preparation of all. These areas, three in number, constitute the core:

1. Organization of knowledge

2. Information and literature needs of social groups; or,
   The audience: general reader, children, students,
   specialists, investigator and research
   worker.

3. Library systems planning and cost effectiveness

Organization of knowledge includes cataloging and classification, but this does not mean a memorization of rules or the indoctrination of selected classification systems. Rather, it embraces some comprehension of logical bases, of language (word-usage), of cataloging codes and classification systems studied against a background of such understanding. It also includes bibliography.

Information and literature needs shifts the focus from book to reader, or audience, and raises questions of needs of typical groups, from research scholars to semi-literate disadvantaged, that may be satisfied through print and non-print media. Broadly, this area involves consideration of the social and scholarly role of libraries, and should also include some attention to the historical evolution of the library, how it may differ geographically in view of population variations (wealth, education, literacy), and how it may change in light of public demands and in consideration of the development of other means for dissemination of information and of literature (cf. television, or the impact of paperbacks).

Library systems planning is conceived of in two senses: (1) inter-relations among libraries through cooperation, inter-library dependence, and development of resource centers; (2) data processing, automation, programming, applications of technology to information storage and retrieval. In this area in particular a background of mathematics and statistics is highly desirable though necessarily acquired outside of the library school itself.

This prescription is in terms of areas, not courses; for each area, probably more than a single course would be necessary, and undoubtedly some of the content suggested by one area may be incorporated in another. This is not a curriculum, but a suggested basis for building one. Nor is this core the whole of library education, but rather the foundation on which further study may be based. This leads to the second aspect of the curriculum, the optional areas.

One might readily visualize specialization, or advanced study, by type of library and by type of activity. Thus one might pursue additional study of the public, academic, school, or special (law, medical, etc.) library; or one might study advanced cataloging, dealing with unusual or esoteric materials and further aspects of cataloging codes, or children's literature, or communication (e.g., reading investigations), or advanced systems planning. Or the student might elect courses from both types. Then there are other specialties in which courses might usefully be offered; e.g., library history, specialized bibliography (by nation or type), comparative librarianship, publishing.

Some of these areas may be considered remote from professional librarianship, and some may be better dealt with outside the library school; it is fruitless to quibble over details, especially since each school must decide course structure and organization for itself. All that is here attempted is the projection of a program that would alleviate if not altogether remove the limitations in current curricula, and, more positively, would approximate the concept of the educated librarian envisaged by Kaplan.

At this point it will be useful to look back at the reactions of the foreign graduates to their experience in American schools. For those who were completely satisfied with what they received a revision might not be altogether welcome. Those looking merely for a degree in the easiest and quickest way would face a more demanding program, though not necessarily an unwelcome one. The seekers for formulas and unalterable rules and descriptions of operations might well be disappointed. Those who expected to apply what they had learned to a position at home, or even in America, might consider the time in library school a waste. But one may hope that such a program would contribute to a certain broadening of the student, even to developing clearer and more sophisticated judgment, though the instrumental values in the form of a job do not eventuate.

To project a program is of course much easier than to put it into practice, even if there should be general agreement on its desirability. There remains the difficult task of translating it into a curriculum, and the still more difficult one of assembling a competent faculty.[7] There are no pat solutions to either task. Still, in some institutions it might be possible to draw on the larger university, both its academic departments and professional schools, such as business, to provide part of the instruction; and some library schools might strengthen their faculties by looking beyond the confines of library experience or competence in the conventional areas of library instruction.

It is unnecessary to emphasize the tentative nature of the suggested program, and much of it must remain vague until a formal curriculum is developed and tested. Furthermore, not all library schools will be able to identify all of its aims with their own, but it is no more essential that all library schools be alike than it is that all law schools or business schools be identical. For that matter, library schools today exhibit sharp variations both in aims and in methods of achieving them. But if it were possible to clarify the aims of each school—selecting definite goals and eschewing others—everything else would fall into place: requirements for admission which are relevant to its goals, faculty selection, course structure, graduation requirements, etc. There might be variations in the degree awarded; programs which differ sharply in level from one another should not be recognized by identical degrees. To put it most simply, a program which is not truly graduate should not culminate in a graduate degree. Or in reverse, a school which prides itself on awarding a graduate degree should provide a program which is truly graduate in nature. From the viewpoint of the prospective student, American or foreign, clear aims are no less important. A student interested only in immediate applications of library techniques should be dissuaded from attending a school with a more theoretical and sophisticated bent; and those interested in, say, programming or automation could not be satisfied with a program almost or completely devoid of such instruction. As we have seen, much of the dissatisfaction expressed by many foreign students could be attributed to their attending the wrong school in view of their hopes and expectations.

But even all truly graduate programs need not be alike in their aims; some may provide the opportunity for specialization in certain areas (information retrieval, medical librarianship) over and above a core program which may be required of all. This type of specialization prevails at present, of course; some foreign students deliberately selected, or were assigned to, the University of Washington because of their interest in its program in law librarianship, and others came to Chicago to concentrate on computer applications to library processes. Specialization will undoubtedly continue, extended to many additional areas.

As earlier noted, virtually all library schools are interested in reform, but translating the interest into accomplishment is not easy. First, there is the power of the field—the prescription (usually presented in fairly general terms) as to what library schools should teach, coupled with the all too facile criticism of the way things are now being done. One library school graduate (that she was foreign is only incidental to the point), unable to adjust readily to the practices of the library that employed her, was asked, "What do they teach you in library school, anyway?"—a comment that merely echoes the criticisms of those who regard the library school essentially as a vocational preparatory school.

Prescriptions and criticisms are various and diffuse, and do not constitute a basis for curricular development. They should of course be listened to and thoughtfully considered, but in the last analysis the school itself must decide its purposes and the methods for achieving them. Perhaps only few schools will accept the role of leadership, of investigation and evaluation of present practices and of charting new directions for the future (few if any do this very effectively at present), but it is a role that is essential.

Beyond the decision of appropriate goals, whether or not influenced by external pressures, is the difficulty of enlisting a faculty competent to move toward them. It is not a question of funds so much as it is of finding and attracting the appropriate teachers at whatever cost. In some schools, where the conventional program keyed to contemporary practice is accepted, the problem though present is less acute than for the schools interested in moving in new and untried directions, and in visualizing their function as transcending library implications. Here the whole panoply of information organization, storage, and retrieval becomes the central consideration rather than the library applications, which in fact may not even exist for most libraries. The faculty to be responsible for such areas ordinarily will not be found in the ranks of library administrators or among the graduates, even at the doctoral level, of most library schools.

Whether or not the school can remove the source of difficulties and disaffection by American as well as foreign students depends on many factors, and some of these the school can do very little about (e.g., language deficiencies, financial problems, lack of background). As we have seen, the most frequent complaints center about the relevance of the curriculum and the quality of the teaching. Relevance will mean different things to different people; a curriculum considered relevant to American conditions may be quite meaningless and inapplicable to some foreign nations, especially those struggling to reach the level where public libraries and popular reading may be considered realistically. But given a solid core of intellectual content plus sufficient flexibility to permit experimentation and exploration, even students from the most disadvantaged environment from a library standpoint should be able to derive some benefit.

FOOTNOTES

1. Announcements, The University of Chicago, The Graduate Library School, 1969-1971, p. 1.

2. Ibid.

3. Kaplan, Abraham, "The Age of the Symbol—A Philosophy of Library Education," in D. R. Swanson, ed., The Intellectual Foundations of Library Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965) pp. 7-16.

4. See Carnovsky, Leon, "The Role of the Public Library: Implications for Library Education," in D. R. Swanson, ed., Ibid., pp. 27-37.

5. Hayes, Robert M., "The Development of a Methodology for System Design and its Role in Library Education," in D. R. Swanson, ed., Ibid., pp. 51-63.

6. Garrison, Guy, "Library Education and the Public Library," Library Journal, 95 (Sept. 1, 1970), pp. 2763-67.

7. "One of the biggest problems facing library education is in the actual formulation of postgraduate courses in librarianship. We have not succeeded in the very least in mastering the relationship between general education and professional education." Stokes, Roy, "The Trading Stamp Mentality," Library Journal, 92 (Oct. 15, 1967), pp. 3595-3600.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The American library school, like American academic institutions generally, has always been hospitable to students from abroad. There is no evidence that the open door is likely to be shut; if anything, because of the increase in the number of library schools and departments, to say nothing of library conditions in foreign lands, the influx will hardly diminish. But problems remain, and solutions range from impractical to suggestive and in need of implementation or at least testing.

The fundamental question confronting every library school is its purpose, or sense of direction. This has been touched on in the preceding chapter; the point was made that a school's aims might be essentially vocational, as they were in the beginning of American library education and continue to the present; or to the vocational might be added a concern with basic social problems and how libraries might be adapted to their solution; or to these there might also be added such related areas as publishing, printing and library history, comparative librarianship, communications, dissemination of information, reading investigations, and numerous others which are neither vocation- nor problem-centered but which offer enough interest and intellectual content to justify attention. If the library schools clearly perceived their real potentialities and limitations in these areas they might be able more logically to face such administrative concerns as the faculty essential to teaching them and the kinds of students they would encourage and attract.

It should be noted that this formulation of library school goals, though to some extent vocation-oriented, bears no relation to problems of shortages or over-supply of library personnel. Employability should not be a factor in determining student admissions. This point is particularly relevant to foreign students, and the fact that many who come have no intention of returning should not affect the school's decision. It may be regrettable from the standpoint of the foreign country that they do not return, but this is completely beyond the school's responsibility. (Actually, some students may indicate their intention of returning and subsequently change their minds. Or some may not be able to return, for political or other reasons.) Whether or not they will be able to find positions after completing their library education, either in the United States or at home, is a risk that they, as well as American students, must take; the library school cannot undertake to find positions for them, though it ordinarily assists as best it can, through recommendations, notification of openings, suggestions of possible employment opportunities, and the like.

The typical foreign applicant, like the American, has only a vague idea of what he expects of his library education; he may express it as preparation for a career in librarianship. But careers may be as diversified as libraries, and they may even transcend libraries to represent careers in related fields, such as information science. And as noted earlier, a career in a foreign library may require far different preparation than for one in an American library. As far as possible, then, once a school has a reasonably clear conception of what it is prepared to do, and what it cannot do—the type of preparation it can offer and the type it cannot—it should apply such understanding to its admission practices, particularly with respect to foreign applicants.

There is no need to discuss general admission practices of library schools; they are based essentially on satisfactory completion of undergraduate education, sometimes with a specification of superior academic performance; and sometimes also on Graduate Record Examination performance. But how apply these criteria to foreign students, coming from an educational background far different from that of their American colleagues? Each school will undoubtedly continue, as it has in the past, to evaluate as best it can from transcripts and tests the quality of the applicant's educational background, particularly in the light of relevant factors in its own program. (As an illustration, a school that places great emphasis on computer organization and programming may insist on a mathematical background; other schools might regard such a lack, if it exists, as unimportant to its curriculum and program.)

The assessment of the background of foreign applicants confronts admission officers in every academic discipline. The problem, and the failure to meet it, is neatly summarized in the following quotation:

> "In all too many cases, foreign students are brought to the U.S. without proper advanced screening and without adequate institutional and social guidance during their stay. Furthermore colleges and universities vacillate between a single standard of academic toughness and a fuzzy and unstructured dual standard of leniency for foreign students...We have not really sorted out the special levels and academic flexibilities needed to handle the peculiar gradations of background which we blithely import by the tens of thousands."[1]

Many American universities have established a special office to screen foreign applicants, and its personnel have available material to facilitate evaluation based on the academic institutions attended abroad. Library schools in universities with such an office are fortunate, though the ultimate decision concerning admissibility must be their own.

Undoubtedly the greatest stumbling-block, both from the standpoint of school and student, has been a poor command of English. Schools that admit students with limited competence in reading, speaking, and writing English can blame only themselves if they have not taken the trouble to test this in advance, preferably before the students appear on the campus. Sometimes this is difficult, and sometimes the test results may not uncover serious limitations. But the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), or an equivalent, should surely be required, and a score not less than 550 on the TOEFL set as a minimum qualification. Others have made the same point about preliminary testing, both concerning library education and academic disciplines in general. After a careful analysis of foreign student problems, including those related to insufficient command of English, Swank wrote: "Every effort should be made to arrange adequate overseas testing, especially of the ability to handle English, before a student is accepted and begins his journey to the United States."[2] And following a long career in library education and as director of the International Relations Office of ALA, Asheim came to the following conclusion:

> "If the applicant lacks sufficient proficiency in the language to carry the load of reading, writing, and class participation that our courses demand, he is not yet ready to enter our program. This is a tough policy, but it is the only one that will accomplish the aims that both the foreign student and the American teacher profess. It will eliminate some of the students who today are creating the most serious problems for us, and for their home countries upon their return."[3]

There are of course problems in arranging tests, but they are not insuperable and are by no means limited to library schools. Thus, "We are convinced that the key to the better quantitative and qualitative control of the foreign student traffic lies in good measure in the strengthening of our information and pre-admission resources overseas."[4]

Once the foreign students have demonstrated academic and linguistic competence sufficient to warrant admission, they should be given some orientation and counselling. As we have seen, many felt "lost", uneasy, and frustrated by a type of red tape to which they were unaccustomed; many were baffled by strange customs and procedures. Though the student normally will make his adjustment without difficulty, a greater degree of personal attention and advice than is generally provided would not be amiss, and would ease the transition to a different culture and way of life. Many universities conduct orientation sessions for their foreign students, and some library schools do this for their own students; and since the number involved in any one year at most library schools is not large, personal attention from a faculty member would be of inestimable value.

Enough has been said in preceding chapters about the curriculum to preclude the need for much additional comment. The key words, as far as foreign students are concerned (and, indeed, many American students as well) are: (1) flexibility—waiving unnecessary course requirements and liberalizing admission to courses inside and outside the library school; (2) curricular revision and expansion, to permit some attention to non-American publications and library practices, and to add courses in library automation and comparative librarianship. Given faculty with appropriate background, courses devoted to individual countries or geographic areas might be offered; Sharify suggests such course titles as Library Resources and Services in the USSR, and The Study, Evaluation and Control of Resources for Latin American Studies in the U.S.[5] (3) Teaching methods, including consideration of assignments and class procedures; and (4) practice—the opportunity to apply theory and textbook teaching in a practical setting. Far from being new, this idea harks back to the beginnings of library education in America, and though currently in partial eclipse, it is still observed by some schools and has been favored by many commentators.[6]

Aside from the suggestions to facilitate the foreign student's American experience, and those pertaining to curricular reforms which might give his professional education more meaning and relevance, there remains the matter of standards. Everyone agrees that sentimentality should play no part as far as any student, foreign or American, is concerned, that a single standard should be observed and that it should be high enough to reflect genuine competence and scholarship. Yet, library schools (perhaps other disciplines as well) have violated the principle, and apparently less has been accepted from the foreign student than would be from the American, though undoubtedly many American students have been permitted to graduate in spite of questionable academic performance. But the library school does no favor to the country to which an unqualified student returns, proudly displaying a degree; indeed, the reputation of his school—and by extension of all library schools—might be badly tarnished. An Indian graduate who earned the doctorate after preparing a highly regarded dissertation commented:

> "I have encountered Ph.D. dissertations in library schools, many of which, in my opinion, would not have been accepted at an Indian university. In fact, the Vice-Chancellor of an Indian university remarked to me that he found it inconceivable that a major American university had granted a Ph.D. in library science to one of his junior faculty for the compilation of a bibliography; a topic which would have been unacceptable in India."

Others of course have made essentially the same point. Swank writes:

> "We have a product that is widely sought by librarians in other countries—not because it has been made easy for them, or even hard, but precisely because of its excellence. We must be certain that the standards that make our schools desirable are not compromised.
>
> "...no kindness is really done when a first-rate degree is awarded for second- or third-rate competence. The degree is cheapened, the student is misled, foreign educators are disillusioned, and librarianship itself is degraded."[7]

And Asheim's comment reinforces these judgments:

> "The purpose of the foreign student who comes to the United States is to be exposed to American education; if we order the program to reflect only the highly specialized needs of his own country, he would do a lot better to take his training at home. We do him no favor to give him a watered-down program. We do not help librarianship in his home country by sending him back with below-standard education. And we harm the reputation of American education by permitting second-rate training to represent us abroad."[8]

Because of the unique characteristics of libraries in every country, one might hope for programs of library education, attuned in great measure to such characteristics, to be developed in each country. This to a considerable extent is what has happened in Europe, and undoubtedly it is largely because of this that the number of European applicants to American schools is small. In order to prepare oneself for a library career in, say, Denmark, one would acquire basic competence by attending that nation's exemplary library school, and he would be far better off than by electing an American institution, though he might attend an American or other foreign school which provided the opportunity for specialized or advanced study. Other countries, too, have library education programs, ranging from elementary to well-developed; many students who come to America from such countries do so for various reasons, all of which have their own justification. Some wish to plant roots and to pursue a career in the United States; some expect to return, better prepared to lead, or to assist, in a library development program; and some come with only an incidental professional or academic commitment, or to see the country, or to expand horizons. Whatever the motive, and whatever the opportunity to study librarianship at home, no one should be discouraged from attending an American school provided he can meet its standards, and provided his expectations do not exceed what the school can give.

Finally, there is the question of an international library school. Since this has hardly progressed beyond a proposal, one can only speculate concerning its nature and prospects. At first glance the idea is attractive, as anything that holds promise of international contacts, understanding, friendship, collaboration, is attractive. The problems of establishing, financing, and staffing such a school are obviously enormous, but even if these were overcome, their consideration is secondary to the basic question of the logic of such a school—what it could be expected to accomplish and whether such accomplishment may not be as well or better achieved in some other way.

To begin with, could the difficulties identified through the testimony of foreign graduates be overcome by such a school? Consider language; the teaching need not necessarily be limited to English, but the chances of including even a few other languages are minimal. Aside from language there is the greater difficulty of developing a curriculum with universal application. Library problems and developments in Asia have little in common with those in Africa or Latin America; and even less with those in North America and Europe.[9]

Would an international school turn out leaders who might vivify library growth in their home countries? The closest thing to an international library school that we have at present is The Inter-American School of Library Science, affiliated with the University of Antioquia in Medellín, Colombia. This school was established in 1956, in the hope and expectation that it would serve as a magnet to attract students from other Latin American countries. To some extent it has succeeded, perhaps more in the special programs and seminars it has sponsored, which drew 158 librarians from 12 Latin American countries,[10] than in attracting potential librarians from outside Colombia as regular students. Between 1958 and 1965 it graduated 102 students, but 89 (87 per cent) were from Colombia, the remainder from only 6 other countries (one each from Bolivia and Venezuela, 2 each from Chile, Paraguay, and Honduras, and 5 from Ecuador). There were none from such populous nations as Argentina and Brazil, probably because of their own highly developed library education programs. A Rockefeller grant of $200,000 for 1966-67 was to be used in part to attract more library science candidates both from Colombia and from other Latin American countries.[11]

The library school at Medellín differs from American (and other) schools in that it offers its program on an undergraduate level. Originally three years in length, since 1964 it extends over four years, of which two are devoted to general studies and two to professional. The professional areas encompass the traditional ones, but undoubtedly keyed to Latin American literature and library problems.[12]

An example of a school approaching the international is the University of Hawaii School of Library Studies. Particularly because of the University's Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange Between East and West, better known as the East-West Center, it has attracted large numbers of students from the Orient, and many who have enrolled in the library school may benefit from contact with the Center. The library school itself, of course, is American-oriented, but it offers a specialized program in education for Asian library service for students from Asian countries, a program largely sponsored by the Center. The library school announcement describes the program in this way:

> Curriculum.—The basic curriculum is that provided for all students; however, the electives are designed to emphasize Asian library development and library studies. Thus the electives include courses in Asian reference works, in acquisition and cataloging of Asian resources, and in administration problems unique in Asian libraries. In some of the basic courses opportunity is given for brief study of the library within a national milieu and of aspects of comparative librarianship.[13]

An Advanced Program in Asian Librarianship is also offered, aimed primarily at faculty and administrators of library study programs. Those admitted to the program must be actively engaged in library education. The opportunity is given to study "(1) the unique needs and characteristics of library development and library education in their own countries, (2) the content of a library studies program and of teaching methods, (3) the complexities of total curriculum and individual course planning. It offers further an opportunity for creative review and revision of their own curricula and for proposing recommendations for change."[14] The advanced program differs from the conventional in that it is not for library practitioners but for teachers of potential librarians; it is a contribution to the strengthening of indigenous library education.

- - - - - - - - - - -

A decade ago a library school director, who had earlier spent about eight years in USIS libraries in the Near East, wrote:

> "The problem of providing library education for the foreign student is not likely to be solved except by time and an ever increasing professionalism in the other nations leading to better status, better library schools, etc. Compared to their problems, ours are minor; and if we feel, as I do, that our system of professional training is not attuned to these people's needs, we must also admit that there exists, in so many cases, no reasonable alternative in the countries of origin."[15]

Ten years later the situation has undoubtedly improved in some countries, but in most it remains substantially unchanged. With all its faults, the American library school has something to contribute, though the applicability of some programs to librarianship in some countries may be questioned. Still, American library schools will continue to be hospitable to foreign students who can meet their standards, and who in turn should derive some benefit from the experience.

The contribution, however, is not one-way. Able and articulate foreign students can add stimulation and fresh ideas to discussions, with particular reference to their own countries, pointing out how variations in national setting may make the American pattern inapplicable or impossible or even unnecessary. Consider library networks, for example. Does this concept make sense in a country with few working libraries, and does it deserve high priority even in parts of the United States where underlying conditions are far different than in New York? Or censorship: how does it operate in other nations, again seen within the legal, historical, religious framework? Such topics, and lots of others, may be visualized more clearly by all students (and faculty as well) if ventilated by fresh ideas from foreign lands.

The continued participation of foreign students in American library education is bright with promise.

FOOTNOTES

1. Bailey, Stephen K., "International Education: Shadow and Substance." Annual School of Education Spring Lecture, Cornell University, April 30, 1963; quoted in University, Government, and the Foreign Student, pp. 43-44.

2. "The Education of Foreign Librarians." Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring, 1961, pp. 198-9.

3. Librarianship in the Developing Countries (Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1966), p. 86.

4. The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?, p. 21.

5. Sharify, Nasser, "The Need for Change in Present Library Science Curricula," in Bone, L.E., ed., Library Education: An International Survey, (University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1968), p. 183.

6. Rothstein, Samuel, "A Forgotten Issue: Practice Work in American Library Education" in Bone, L.E., ed., op. cit., pp. 197-222.

7. Swank, op cit., p. 195-6.

8. Op. cit., p. 85.

9. The leading proponent of an international library school, Mr. Guy A. Marco, is quite aware of the formidable problems incident to its establishment. See his "The Idea of an International Library School," Library World, 72 (December 1970) pp. 191-2.

10. Floren, Luis, "The Interamerican School of Library Science of the University of Antioquia: Its Origins and its Future," in Bonn, G.S., ed., Library Education and Training in Developing Countries. (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1966), p. 156.

11. The shortcomings of the school as an international institution are emphasized by Manuel Salvador Alguero in his "The Inter-American Library School as a Major Training Facility for Latin

America," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring 1966, pp. 243-51.

12. Floren, op. cit., p. 151-2.

13. University of Hawaii, 1971/1972 School of Library Studies, p. 8.

14. Ibid., p. 9.

15. Cited in Leon Carnovsky, "The Foreign Student in the Accredited Library School," p. 106.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The literature on student exchange is extensive, and much of it deals with student reactions to the host institution and with experiences in the foreign country. Since so much of this literature is readily available in most university and many research libraries it is not listed here. The following listing is limited to titles referred to in this report.

Asheim, Lester, Librarianship in the Developing Countries. Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1966.

Bone, L. E., ed. Library Education; An International Survey. Champaign: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1968.

Bonn, George S., ed., Library Education and Training in Developing Countries. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1966.

Breivik, Patricia, "Objective-Type Examinations and the International Student," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring 1970.

Carnovsky, Leon, "Foreign Students in Accredited Library Schools," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Fall 1960.

The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome? (A Report from Education and World Affairs, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, 10036.)

Garrison, Guy, "Library Education and the Public Library," Library Journal, 95 (Sept. 1, 1970).

International Research Associates, Inc. The Effectiveness of the Exchange Program. (Prepared for The United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.) International Research Associates, Inc., 1962.

Salvador Alguero, Manuel, "The Inter-American Library School as a Major Training Facility for Latin America," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring 1966.

Stokes, Roy, "The Trading Stamp Mentality," Library Journal, 92 (Oct. 15, 1967).

Swank, Raynard C., "The Education of Foreign Librarians," Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring 1961.

Swanson, D. R., ed., The Intellectual Foundations of Library Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

University, Government, and the Foreign Graduate Student. College Entrance Examination Board, 1969.